

The Council met at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, the 17th day of March 1922, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR Avargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No. 15—

(1) Printed copies of the questions and answers to be put and given at a meeting of the Council shall be placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

(2) The questions shall be put and answered in the following manner:—

The Secretary shall call the name of each interpellator in alphabetical order, specify the serial numbers of his questions and make a sufficient pause to allow him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place if he is desirous of asking a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.]

Premature retirement of officers due to Reforms.

1373 Q.—The RAJA OF RAMNAD: With reference to the answer given to question No. 1262 at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 15th February 1922 regarding the premature retirement of I.C.S. officers, will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to say how and by whom the Government were precluded from giving the information asked for?

A.—The hon. Member is referred to the India Office communiqué which appeared in the newspapers on the 13th March.

Election expenses of Members of Councils.

1374 Q.—The RAJA OF RAMNAD: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether all the candidates who contested seats to the Madras Legislative Council and to the Council of State and Legislative Assembly from Madras have lodged returns of their election expenses under the rules governing elections and, if any have failed to do so, what action has been taken against them?

A.—All the candidates except one lodged returns of their election expenses under the rules governing elections, but the return lodged by one of them was not in the prescribed form. The candidate who failed to lodge his return of election expenses and the candidate whose return of election expenses was not in proper form, both incurred the disqualification mentioned in rule 5 (4) of the Electoral Rules and this fact was duly notified in the Gazette.

The Deputy President of the Madras Legislative Council.

1375 Q.—The RAJA OF RAMNAD: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether the absence of the Deputy President of the Legislative Council, Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai, who is on deputation to British Guiana for a period of more than six months, is permissible under the rules, whether he continues to be Deputy President, whether he draws pay for the period of his absence, and, if it is not permissible, why no action has been taken to fill up the vacancy?

A.—His Excellency the Governor has condoned the absence of Diwan Bahadur M.R.Ry. P. Kesava Pillai from Madras and Mr. Kesava Pillai continues as Deputy President and draws pay as such. What the rules are the hon. Member is referring to is not clear.

[17th March 1922]

II

SPEECH BY THE HON. THE PRESIDENT *RE* THE TIME-LIMIT ON
MOTIONS ON DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Before taking up the motions on the Budget I have to inform the House that the Local Government have intimated to me that in pursuance of section 72-D (3) of the Government of India Act they have indicated in italics in the Budget Estimates for 1922-23 those items of expenditure in regard to which they are not submitting any proposals to the House. Hon. Members are aware that His Excellency the Governor has allotted under sub-rule (1) of rule 29 nine days from the 17th to the 27th March (excluding the two Sundays) for the discussion of the demands of the Local Government. Under sub-rule (2) of the above rule His Excellency has been pleased to fix one day as the maximum for the discussion of the motions on each of the following demands, viz., Land Revenue, General Administration, Education (non-European) and Civil Works—In charge of Public Works officers (Transferred portions), and half a day as the maximum for motions affecting each of the other demands. I would invite the attention of hon. Members to the fact that, within the period of nine days allowed for the purpose, the House will have to dispose of so many as 35 demands, each comprising several heads of account. The number of motions for omission or reduction of grants or items of grants has totalled about 800. Hon. Members will see that considerable expedition will be needed and I would appeal to them to use that expedition. I would also suggest to hon. Members, if I may, to distinguish between the more important motions and the less important ones. Neither the rules nor the standing orders prescribe any time-limit for the speeches to be made at this stage. I have, however, following the precedent of last year, resolved to fix 10 minutes as the time-limit for the hon. Members who move motions or reductions of grants or items of grants, and also 10 minutes to the hon. Members of the Government who have to answer those motions; all other hon. Members will have 5 minutes each. I shall enforce the time-limits strictly; and I appeal to hon. Members to help me to do so. Hon. Members will see that under rule 29 (3), at the close of the nine days allowed for the purpose, it will be my duty to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of all outstanding matters in connexion with the demands for grants."

III

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND I.—LAND REVENUE.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" Sir, I move for Demand I standing in my name in respect of Land Revenue department amounting to Rs. 227-59 lakhs. The details of this grant will be found on page 4 of the statement which, I think, is in the hands of hon. Members."

Motion 1.

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" Mr. President, I move—

1. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,72,190 for treasury deputy collectors by Rs. 100.*

"My object is to ascertain what policy the Government wishes to adopt in the matter of the salaries of the Provincial officers. It has already been

17th March 1922] [Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju]

stated by the hon. the Finance Member that the system of time-scale recently introduced has an adverse bearing on the revenues of the province and the expanding revenues even cannot be able to cope with this annual increment on account of time-scale. Before this system takes deep root in the country, I think it is necessary to examine the desirability of continuing the new system now introduced in all the services. That is the reason why I have given notice of this motion.

"My second object is to bring to the notice of the Government the fact that the present scale in the opinion of some is very high and it also requires revision. No doubt the present scale was arrived at as the result of examination in the past; but conditions are changing and we should take into consideration the fact that prices are falling. Therefore in my humble opinion the system of salaries does require revision again. This province is purely an agricultural province and the sources of taxation are limited and are not capable of expansion. Whatever be the justification for the continuation of the system in other provinces, the conditions in this province require a careful examination in the light of the present financial situation. For these reasons, Sir, I make my motion."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—
"Sir, so far as the question of the treasury deputy collector is concerned, I think, I may again inform the House, which I believe I did on a previous occasion, that the question of transferring them to the Imperial Audit Department is now under consideration. The Government of India have been in correspondence with the Madras Government in regard to the desirability of the transfer to the Audit Department, which is Imperial, of control over district treasuries in this province. If the control over the district treasuries is transferred to the Audit Department, the treasury deputy collectors who are now in charge of the district treasuries will no longer be Provincial officers, and they will become Imperial officers. The details of this proposal have been almost worked out. An officer representing the Audit Department of the Government of India and another officer representing the Madras Government were placed on special duty recently and they toured in some parts of the province, conferred with collectors and treasury deputy collectors and have submitted their report. The Auditor-General was himself here the other day and I had the benefit of a talk with him on the same question. The matter therefore is practically under discussion and probably the treasury deputy collectors will be transferred to the Government of India. But as regards the general issue that has been raised by the hon. Mover as to what policy we intend pursuing in the matter of time-scale of salaries, that has been sanctioned not only in this province but I take it all over India, and not merely in respect of provincial services but also in respect of all-India services, non-gazetted services and even menial appointments."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. I do not think that such a wide question could be discussed on a motion to reduce the allotment for treasury deputy collectors. I was probably wrong in having allowed the hon. Mover to take up the general question. The hon. the Revenue Member should confine himself to the question of treasury deputy collectors."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—
11-15 a.m. "So far as the question of treasury deputy collectors is concerned, that is all I have got to say. Inasmuch as I was asked about the future policy which this province was going to observe in regard

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [17th March 1922]

to the revision of salaries of all provincial services I thought I would not be doing justice to the hon. Member if I refrained from answering him."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"In the light of your ruling I do not press it, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 2.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

2. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,72,190 for treasury deputy collectors by Rs. 25,000. (Abolition of 3 posts out of 23.)*

"Sir, as one of those that have given notice of several motions which I see has been followed by several of my friends, I should like to say, with your permission, that by making these motions we do not in the least cast any slur upon any particular official. I am sorry to say that in many of these departments, a number of high officials think that it is a reflection on them. . . ."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Order, order. The hon. Member is straying from the point. I do not think the question is what the impression of officials generally is in regard to motions generally made by hon. Members here. The hon. Member must confine himself to the specific proposal to abolish 3 out of 23 treasury deputy collectors."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I bow to your ruling, Sir. I heard that these treasury deputy collectors think that it is some reflection on them when we are making suggestions for their reduction. So far as the treasury deputy collectors are concerned, we have to see, with all respect to them, whether their retention is a matter of necessity. But, in the case of divisions, we find the divisional officers necessary. If we have plenty of money we should certainly give more salary to these people and to the treasury deputy collectors and appoint more of them. But as matters stand it is absolutely necessary, I think, that we must make some reduction. We want to have 3 of the posts reduced out of 23. Our argument may be based on two points. We think that the number of the districts can be reduced. That is relevant to the fact. Now at present, there is a treasury deputy collector in every district. Therefore the reduction in the number of the treasury deputy collectors will follow as a consequence the reduction in the number of districts. But even if the number of districts is not reduced, I think we can easily reduce the number of treasury deputy collectors, as in many places the work has been reduced. We know, Sir, that the old treasury deputy collector was also the vice-president of the district board, and he was doing the work of the district board, and he was doing various other duties. He was personal assistant to the Collector so far as appointments were concerned. In fact he was looking after the general administration of the whole district. Now, that has been taken away from him; and his most important work, i.e., the duty of checking cash, an important work in the treasury, has been taken away from him owing to branches of the Imperial Bank having been established in many centres. Therefore the only important business left is to check the various bills. But we know that these bills are checked by the various clerks and managers of the office. No doubt the treasury deputy collector endorses the checking. I will submit that in some of the districts where the work is not heavy, it could be arranged to be done by the head ministerial officer. Therefore without any change of

17th March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

policy we could effect some small reduction. So far as the treasury deputy collectors are concerned I am sure you will be able to find three districts where they can be abolished. The work may be done in the general branch, the bills may be signed by the Collector himself or the personal assistant or the huzur sarishtadar. That, Sir, is the main ground which has induced me to make this motion and I think the Government will have no objection to this small reduction."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" May I say, Sir, from the financial point of view this question of the reduction of districts is a matter that can only be taken up after a very full and careful inquiry? The hon. Member may remember that it took something like ten years before any orders were passed upon the inquiry made by Sir William Meyer. It is a most terrible business, and it could not be undertaken in a short time.

"As regards the proposal that the Collector should do his treasury deputy collector's work, that would really come to abolishing the Collector. The treasury deputy collector is busy in the treasury all day with routine work and if you tie the Collector there, he cannot do anything else. As for the proposal to put the huzur sarishtadar in charge the Comptroller-General would not accept it. I should like to say lastly that, from our point of view, there is no advantage to Madras in cutting out these officers. We are just going to hand them over to the Comptroller-General. When the Comptroller-General takes them over, he will take over the establishment as it stands. To hand over to him an establishment which is inadequate for the work would not be advantageous to Madras and would only lead to difficulties on the part of the Comptroller-General."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, may I ask the hon. the Finance Member whether any adjustment, on account of this duty of the Comptroller-General, will be made by the Local Governments or whether the whole cost would be debited to the Central Government?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" The whole cost of the establishment will be debited to the Central Government. The main object of the joint inquiry that has been made recently is to see how these duties can be carried on without involving any extra cost to Provincial Government as a result of the handing over of officers who are doing a considerable amount of work on account of the Provincial Government. Our sole anxiety in carrying out the transfer to the Central is to do so without involving any extra expense."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Only one word, Sir, and I shall withdraw the motion. The hon. the Finance Member said that personal assistants are very few. I know that. I suggested a reduction of only a very few of the treasury deputy collectors. The hon. the Finance Member did not suggest one head under which there might be some possibility of reduction."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" I should only be too glad if I could give the hon. Member any hope of reduction. The position however is this. The treasury deputy collector is doing a lot of work for the Provincial Government outside the treasury."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I said Sir, that they were doing before."

[17th March 1922]

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"We have to hand over them bodily to the Government of India just as the whole charges for the treasury will be handed over. The trouble will be we shall not be able to get any outside work from them. It is the same position as the handing over of the local boards practically to elected officers. If the tahsildars do not do the work they formerly did, the presidents will have to find some one else to do it. The whole trouble is how to carry on such work as the treasury deputy collector is doing outside the treasury without incurring any additional expenditure. Mr. Lloyd has been on special duty and his sole endeavour has been to see that we do not incur any extra expense."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 3 to 20.

The following motions were not made:—

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—

3. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,640 for personal allowances to accountants by Rs. 100.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI:—

4. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 5,640 for personal allowances to accountants.*

5. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,248 for personal allowances.*

6. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 600 for personal allowances under military payment.*

7. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,848 for personal allowances under local fund audit establishment.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—

8. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 37,500 for travelling allowance by Rs. 3,750.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

9. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 37,500 for travelling allowance by Rs. 3,750.*

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—

10. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 37,500 for travelling allowance by Rs. 3,750.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—

11. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 37,500 for travelling allowance by Rs. 3,750.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI:—

12. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 37,500 for travelling allowance by Rs. 19,000.*

17th March 1922]

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

13. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 37,500 for travelling allowance by Rs. 7,500.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

14. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 37,500 for travelling allowance by Rs. 3,750.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

15. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 37,500 for travelling allowance by Rs. 3,750.*

Sriman Sasi BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—

16. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,280 for local allowance for Treasury Deputy Collector's establishment, the Nilgiris.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

17. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,25,400 for treasury establishments by Rs. 1 lakh.*

Sriman Sasi BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—

18. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 9,600 for two deputy collectors under subdivisional establishments.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

19. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 42,000 for subdivisional establishments.*

Rao Bahadur E. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

20. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 42,000 for temporary subdivisional establishments.*

Motion 21.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

21. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 42,000 for subdivisional establishments by Rs. 12,000.*

"Sir, in December, a resolution of mine was taken up regarding the location of the court of Special Deputy Collector, Chandragiri, to try Estates Land Act suits at Tirupati. The hon. the Law Member then said that he was considering as to whether that court should be abolished after 1st April 1922 or whether it should be continued. In view of that I want to ascertain whether it is to be abolished or not. I may submit, Sir, that it is absolutely unnecessary to continue the court hereafter. As the hon. the Law Member said, 80 per cent of the suits that come to that court go uncontested. Most of them are suits relating to recovery of rent. In these circumstances, I submit that the Revenue Divisional Officer can well dispose of the work that is there and no special court is necessary. When we are hard pressed for money, I think the Government will accept this motion for retrenchment."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—

"Sir, the four temporary deputy collectors for whom provision has been made on page 35 of the Budget Estimate consist of one deputy collector on special duty in the Sivaganga and Ramnad zamindaris and three deputy collectors

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [17th March 1922]

placed at the disposal of the Law Department to try suits under the Estates Land Act. We on the revenue side have no control whatsoever as regards the fixation of places to which these three officers should be posted. The Law Department decides that question for itself as to whether a deputy collector is needed for that specific duty and whether there is a sufficiently large quantity of Estates work. An application is made to us by the Law Department that a deputy collector is wanted; to the extent of the budget provision we place that officer at its disposal; when the budget provision is exhausted we give them an emphatic no. Without this special agency it would be obligatory on the ordinary revenue divisional officer to try cases under the Estates Land Act also. There are places where he can do so. There are again places where he could not do so on account of the bulk of the work that has to be done. It is more or less for the Law Department to decide it. This allotment of Rs. 12,000 which the hon. Mover wishes to cut out from this provision would leave the deputy collectors as they are, but it would cut out the establishment that should be employed under them which would be rather undesirable. So long as the number of deputy collectors remains what it is, the temporary establishments could not be curtailed."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" We referred this question to the Board of Revenue. We have got a reply stating 'we are considering it'. We have not given our opinion."

11-30 a.m.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" There is a motion in my name to omit the whole allotment of Rs. 42,000. The hon. the Revenue Member told us what the four temporary deputy collectors budgeted for under this head were doing. It would be advantageous for the House if he would tell us also what the other deputy collectors are doing, so that we may know what they are for. Anyhow, I do not press the motion."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" So far as this motion is concerned, Rs. 42,000 allotted in the budget is only for the pay of the temporary deputy collectors and not for their establishments. The object of my reduction, therefore, is to affect also the establishments of the deputy collectors. So far as the number of deputy collectors is concerned, I am sorry the hon. the Law Member has not been able to give us a definite assurance on the point. I think it is unnecessary to have a special deputy collector for suits work in Chandragiri. If the hon. the Law Member will give us an assurance, I have no objection to withdraw my motion."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I have not made up my mind and the hon. Member's opinion will certainly have its due weight when I arrive at a conclusion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 22 and 23.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

22. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 42,000 for subdivisional establishments by Rs. 100.

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

23. To omit the allotment of Rs. 42,000 for subdivisional establishments.

17th March 1922]

Motion 24.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"The motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

24. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 42,000 for subdivisional establishments.*

"I want information as to what the other two deputy collectors are doing."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"The two deputy collectors shown on the same page belong to the permanent cadre and they are now employed in the Bellary and Anantapur districts on resettlement work."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"I do not press my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 25 to 29.

The following motions were not made—

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

25. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 42,000 for subdivisional establishments.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

26. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 42,000 for subdivisional establishments.*

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

27. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 42,000 for subdivisional establishments.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

28. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 42,000 for subdivisional establishments.*

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

29. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 42,000 for subdivisional establishments.*

Motion 30.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"The motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

30. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,17,800 for tahsildars by (abolition of 18 out of 168) half a lakh.*

"I beg to suggest, Sir, that 18 out of 168 posts be abolished. Of course it will be said by the hon. the Revenue Member that we have touched the lowest minimum. I do not know what his point of view is, but so far as I am concerned we could go very much lower. Therefore, so far as this reduction is concerned there will be no change of policy. In fact, in the year 1911, it may be due to Meyer's scheme, the number of taluks was considerably increased. So far as we are able to see, the work of the tahsildars is not greater now than what it was before when they had a good deal of work to do with regard to local boards. Now, practically, they are given no local fund work in some districts, like Coimbatore where the higher officials have issued instructions that on no account they should help the local fund department. In these days, when travelling is much easier, there are number of departments which are dealt with by their respective departmental heads. About only one-tenth reduction of the number may not be very much and since we think that we should have some reduction made somewhere—of

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

[17th March 1922]

course from the Government's point of view no reduction will be possible—it would be quite possible for them to find out in what districts they may curtail the number. In any case, without changing their policy, and consistently with efficiency and all those qualifications put forth by the Government, the number of tahsildars can be curtailed easily by 18. There is no use of withdrawing every motion and then asking the Government to make a reduction of 3 lakhs or 4 lakhs. Therefore, I submit that the hon. the Revenue Member will be pleased to give us some assurance that some reductions will be made, 18 or anything. I think one taluk in every district can be easily abolished. Therefore, I move that 18 posts out of 168 be abolished."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, the House is probably not aware of the fact that the sanctioned cadre of tahsildars is 217, whereas we have got at the present moment only 168 budgeted for. When the Land Records Department was abolished, the duty that was being done by special tahsildars employed for land records work alone was thrown on the shoulders of the ordinary land revenue tahsildars. It looked as though the discharge of that additional work could not be satisfactorily done unless and until some relief was given to these tahsildars by curtailing their jurisdictions and increasing their number, but I refused to be carried away by that temptation. I have, therefore, provided in the budget for only 168 tahsildars. If that number is again to be curtailed by an indefinite number of 18, leaving me only 150 tahsildars, the only alternative will be that once more we have to requisition the services of a special officer for re-distributing the taluks equally so that the number of taluks in the presidency may not exceed 150. As things stand, it will be certainly impossible to merely look at the district map or the presidency map and draw a line in a particular manner and thus determine the future jurisdiction of each tahsildar. That, of course, would create administrative difficulties which I think the House may be aware of. Under the circumstances, the House cannot say that I have made an extravagant demand. On the other hand, I have asked for an irreducible minimum, for which the House will, I hope, agree."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I think that it will not be possible for the hon. the Revenue Member to reduce the existing number of tahsildars. Tahsildars like village headmen have to perform all kinds of duties. They may all on a sudden be asked to send up a report on, say, snakes, or wild animals, or on the political situation, etc. I know they have been working very hard. I therefore think that practically it will not be possible to reduce the existing number of tahsildars."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"May I ask the hon. the Revenue Member as to whether the land records tahsildars are included in the sanctioned cadre of tahsildars, viz., 217?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"No, Sir."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I would like to oppose this motion more on a question of principle which I think this House has to bear in mind than on the actual merits of it. I would like the House to keep an open mind when deciding whether the number of tahsildars should be reduced or not. Even an open mind is one thing and trying to bring about a change when we have not had occasion to consider all the merits of the case is

17th March 1922]

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

another. I have listened to the amendment proposed by my friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar. He seems to proceed on the assumption that if we cut short the allotment, the Government will somehow be able to carry out a particular policy which this House has had no opportunity to consider on its merits and decide upon. That assumption is not correct. What my hon. Friend should do is this: I hope he will excuse my saying that all his other amendments also seem to be of the same nature as this one—he should have all these matters settled through the agency of the Finance Committee and a working policy formulated there and then move this House for necessary reduction to be made. Instead of doing this, if he goes on in this way, it will only create confusion.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ Sir, if we are to abide by the advice given by hon. Member Mr. Ramalinga Reddi there would be no necessity for reduction of any grant for any establishment at all. I think Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, being somewhat new to this province, is hesitating to cut down the expenditure. But I assure him that I have been long in this province and I know in my own district there is one taluk too many. It was created some time ago and I find, Sir, that that taluk can be abolished and amalgamated with neighbouring taluks. If this is so in my district, it must be equally so in other districts also. Therefore, Sir, there shall be no difficulty in accepting this motion. Unless we reduce the grant the Government will not at all think in that direction. That is why we must cut short the provision for the number of tahsildars. I heartily support the motion.”

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—“ May I beg the hon. the Revenue Member to say as to whether the provision made at page 82 of the Budget Estimates for 23 tahsildars is not in addition to the 168 tahsildars for whom provision is made at page 36 ? ”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“ They are taluk magistrates. Establishments which appear under 22 D (c) do not relate to the Land Revenue Department. Certain officers belonging to the Land Revenue Department are lent to other departments where they do work for those other departments.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ Was it in the previous year included in the 216 referred to by the hon. the Revenue Member? In that case the alleged reduction is not fair.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I am going to withdraw the motion, but I simply want to say this. I believe, Sir, I have heard Mr. Ramalinga Reddi speaking of bureaucrats. He was a bureaucrat till very recently and it will take many years for him to shake off his bureaucratic notions completely.

“ The unfortunate thing is, we were very anxious to suggest that a committee may be appointed in which the whole question may be decided. In the absence of that we have to make some reduction, and, if we cannot do that, let us by one resolution pass the 13 crores and odd rupees.

“ It was in that year, 1911, that the number of tahsildars, the number of deputy collectors and the number of collectors were all increased. We were then rolling in wealth and therefore we could be luxurious, but now it is a question of poverty and not plenty. Government officers have got a lot of establishment when they are in office, but when they retire they are content with a very small number of servants.

11-45 a.m.

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [17th March 1922]

Now, it is a question of whether a few officers should be reduced or not. From that point of view, we ask the Government to reduce the officers, as a matter of necessity and as a matter of discretion, and I think they can easily be reduced. I propose a reduction only of 18 officers which comes only to about one for each district. So I appeal once more, although I am going to withdraw my motion, to the hon. the Revenue Member not to consider the existing number as the irreducible minimum, but something like a minimum from which some reduction may be made. Since we have got to have some reduction somewhere, and the work of tahsildars has been to some extent taken away by other officers, and during the last twenty years the number of tahsildars, deputy collectors and magistrates has increased, I want that the number of tahsildars should be reduced. The number can again be increased when we want and when we have got more money by some windfall or some other cause. But under the present circumstances when we have practically to go to the Insolvency Court, I submit that by reductions we may manage to have no deficit instead of borrowing and paying back with interest. If the hon. the Revenue Member wishes to make reductions somewhere, I think the reduction in the number of tahsildars would be the easiest thing that can be managed. So, with the further appeal to the Revenue Member to make some reductions in the course of the year, I should like to withdraw my motion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Does Mr. Ramachandra Rao wish to say anything on this motion?"

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I simply wanted to point out, Sir, that I heard Mr. Ramalinga Reddi raise a question of what he considered to be an open mind, but many of the motions on the agenda which stand in his name are open to the same objection." (Laughter.)

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 31.

The following motion was not made:—

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI:—

31. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 13,764 for personal allowance to clerks under special fund audit establishment.*

Motion 32.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Sir, I beg to make the motion which stands in my name and which runs thus:—

32. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,12,000 for temporary taluk establishments by Rs. 1,50,000.*

"Sir, hon. Members would find on a reference to the Budget that the budget estimate for 1921-22 for temporary establishments was Rs. 6,55,000, and the revised estimate for that year is Rs. 4,02,000. This was due to the probable savings of Rs. 2,02,712 entered below in the Budget. In 1920-21, the previous year, the amount was Rs. 3,75,000. Now we find, instead of budgeting for Rs. 3,75,000 as in 1920-21, or for Rs. 4,02,000 according to the revised estimates of 1921-22, that a provision is made in the next year's budget for Rs. 5,12,000, which is an increase of over a lakh of rupees over the revised estimates of the current year. I submit, Sir, that at a time of financial stringency, to add to the amount that we were able to spend last

17th March 1922]

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

year or even the year before last by more than one lakh would only add to the amount of the deficit at the end of the Budget, which we must try to reduce as much as possible. I submit, Sir, that prudence requires that we should curtail expenditure.

“And, secondly, I want to raise a question of principle, and it is this. We are asked not only under this heading but also under ‘Survey and Settlement’ to give our sanction to something like 11 lakhs for temporary establishments. What exactly is the nature of these temporary establishments, for how many months are they proposed to be employed, and in what districts we have absolutely no information given to us in the Budget. I certainly agree with Mr. Ramalinga Reddi when he said that this Budget gives a maximum of statistics but minimum of information. In these circumstances, as a matter of principle I should say that while we could manage with Rs. 4,02,000 last year, there is no reason why we should spend more, i.e., Rs. 5,00,000 for the Budget year under temporary establishments. If this item is cut down, it would not embarrass the Government at all, as it is open to the Government to come again with a supplementary demand and to say for what period, for what kind and amount of work, and for what districts the temporary establishments may be required, and it would be then for the House to consider and sanction such demand. The reduction which I propose, far from embarrassing the Government, would make it possible for the members of this House at a later stage to have more information as to what it is exactly they would have to vote for. For these reasons, Sir, I move that the allotment for temporary taluk establishments be reduced by Rs. 1,12,000.”

MR. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—“Mr. President, I would like to give my hearty support to this motion. Here we are viewing from an altogether different standpoint. We are not in any way interfering with what I may call the regular establishment of the Government, and we are not making any arbitrary suggestions as to how many officers have to be appointed or how many can be reduced. We are dealing with a temporary establishment, something indefinite, something which would not be required all the year round, and something about which we have no information whatsoever. For two reasons I would like to press this motion, if need be, to a division. One is that we should like to have more information about this temporary establishment. Secondly, since these offices are temporary no great embarrassment or even inconvenience would be caused to Government. Even if we cut it down by a sum of Rs. 1,12,000 as proposed in this motion, there is nothing to prevent them from coming to this House again for a supplementary grant, and I think it would be advisable for this House so to make its proposals for reduction as to make the Government come occasionally to us and not to ignore us altogether until next March. We ought to be in a position occasionally to exercise the very legitimate pressure that all legislatures do through the power of the purse, and we believe that motions of this kind are the least inconvenient on which we can take action of the kind proposed.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—“Sir, a good deal of misapprehension as regards the purposes which this allotment is intended to serve has been caused by reason of the fact that under the heading ‘Taluk establishments’ we have made a provision of 5 lakhs and odd on account of temporary establishments. It is therefore assumed,

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [17th March 1922]

I believe, that this temporary establishment is intended to replenish the establishment attached to each taluk from time to time for doing what is regarded as normally the duty of the taluk staff. That is not the case at all. The purposes for which this sum of Rs. 5,00,000 and odd is intended to be utilized are these : In the first place it is utilised in those districts where survey and settlement parties are at work, and where the work that is done by the settlement and survey parties has to be brought up to date. With regard to the maintenance of correct records, some temporary establishment has got to be taken in the taluk offices for the purpose of revising their registers in the light of the results of the survey and settlement operations. This work is merely confined to those districts where the survey and settlement operations have advanced to a stage at which the results of that work have to be assimilated in the records of the taluk offices. For that purpose, we want an allotment of Rs. 4,39,417 which, the House will remember, is far less than what the Board of Revenue itself considered would be necessary for the carrying on of that work. There is a small allotment of Rs. 420 for the purpose of sorting and re-writing old records. It is a work which is done almost every year to the extent that such sorting and re-writing becomes necessary, and after all, this amount is a trifle. There is an allotment of Rs. 12,000 for temporary establishments in districts where Loans work is in operation. The House knows that we have granted large loans freely in the Ceded districts in particular on account of famine, and we were anxious that the Loans work should not form one of the ordinary duties of an already over-worked revenue official. We had therefore to employ temporary establishments for the purpose of expediting the distribution of loans in districts where loans had been sanctioned. We have got a sum of Rs. 4,000 entered for patta transfer work in taluk offices. It is, as every revenue officer will realise, an obligatory duty which we cannot certainly neglect if the tenant wants his pattas to be correct. Then, Sir, during the heavy kist seasons, which we all know do not occur throughout the year, it becomes necessary to supplement the regular shroffs' establishment in the taluk offices by adding one or two additional temporary shroffs to cope with the heavy treasury transactions. As soon as the season of heavy kist collection is over those establishments are at once disbanded. The principle which has been followed is to retain on the permanent establishment only that minimum which has got work all the year round, and to take on from time to time such temporary establishment as may be considered necessary for the discharge of temporary work which arises for particular reasons and then to disband that establishment rather than retain always a larger number of permanent men than may be necessary for the transaction of ordinary work. That I think is a sound financial policy.

" Some reference was made to the fact that in the previous year's budget we find an allotment of Rs. 6,55,000, whereas the revised figure for that year is only Rs. 4,02,000. May I at once explain, Sir, that I am not at all responsible for this reduction. If I can cite any witness to prove the authority against whom I can to bring that charge, it will unfortunately be found that the same individual will be both the witness and the accused, and that is my hon. Colleague the Finance Member (laughter). For we were told to effect all possible economies in the course of the current year wherever we could, and that we might reduce, as far as possible, the allotments under the head of temporary establishments. This was done in the hope of renewing such surrenders that we had made in the current year in the course

17th March 1922] [Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

of the next year. Wherever we thought that the work would not materially suffer by the postponement of any work we willingly surrendered in pursuance of the request of the Finance Member. On the other hand the demand from the Board of Revenue in respect of actual work that has to be done for the next year was for Rs. 7,10,000. There, again, the pruning knife of the Finance Member was applied freely, and instead of giving us the sum of Rs. 7,10,000 which the Board of Revenue asked for, in view of the material curtailment of the same allotment during the current year, we obtained an allotment of not more than Rs. 5,12,000. Well, Sir, if any portion of this establishment is done away with, the only consequence will be that work will have to be spread over a number of years. If it is so spread over, we can easily imagine whether it will be conducive to the interests of the parties concerned, or whether the work will be well done if it is done tardily. The survey and settlement parties cannot be kept on for two or three years indefinitely until we go on adding a little to the temporary establishments from year to year. What will be the consequence, I ask, if you keep the survey and settlement parties in the districts for longer periods than necessary? The expenditure will be far greater than the comparatively smaller expenditure incidental to the temporary establishments. For these reasons, I hope the hon. Mover will not press his motion."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :— "Mr. President, during 12 noon. the course of the debate last year on a similar motion the hon. the Revenue Member was pleased to say that a portion of this sum was allotted for leave reserve, and the question was being examined. I do not think we were informed as to how the inquiry resulted and what policy the Government was going to adopt with regard to it."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :— "May I at once set the hon. Member's mind at rest, Sir? We have abandoned the scheme as a measure of economy."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :— "And then it was further stated that the lump provision would be subjected to the scrutiny of the Finance Committee. And whether it was examined by the Finance Committee and whether they were satisfied with the allotment is not known."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :— "Sir, I wish to support this motion. I was listening carefully to my hon. Friend the Revenue Member. He has adduced a number of arguments to support his position. I have not been impressed with the strength of his arguments. He said that on account of the prevalence of famine in some parts of the Ceded districts, it had become necessary to employ some men for the purpose of granting loans. That, I believe, is the only new thing undertaken this year. For that purpose alone the amount of one lakh and odd asked for, for the year 1922-23, is not necessary. The hon. the Revenue Member called as his witness the hon. the Finance Member. There is no witness, probably on the face of the earth, in whom I shall place more reliance than upon this particular witness. I know the efforts he had made in all ways to reduce, as far as possible, the expenditure, and when the hon. the Revenue Member asked for the grant of 6½ lakhs, the Finance Member reduced it to 4 lakhs and 12 thousand. The Finance Member knows, probably more than any other member in this House, the amount that will be necessary, as far as one

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar] [17th March 1922]

can see, for a purpose like this and he has thought fit, according to my friend the Revenue Member, to reduce $6\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs to 4 lakhs and odd. My friend Mr. Muniswami Nayudu wants to reduce it by 1,12,000. If this reduction is carried out, I do not at all think that the work of the Government will in any way suffer. I think in the interests of the public we should make this reduction. And if in the course of the year the Revenue Member finds that it is impossible to carry out the scheme with this amount, he can certainly come before us and I do not think that the House will then refuse the grant."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"I beg to support this motion. What the hon. the Revenue Member said is that a bulk of the amount goes to the Survey and Settlement department. I suppose the standing orders of the Board of Revenue (the departmental rules) make it obligatory on the staff of the revenue establishment to see that the revenue registry and the survey marks are kept intact and the revenue registry are according to the enjoyment. These duties are performed by the land revenue staff. If that is so there is no necessity at all for this temporary staff to prepare accounts or registers for the settlement and survey parties. The existing land records, if properly maintained by the revenue staff would enable the survey and settlement party to execute their work. So it seems, Sir, that this amount of 65 lakhs is spent on account of the negligence of the revenue staff allowed to go on in the course of 30 years. And if my recollection is correct, hitherto, at any rate 10 or 15 years ago, there was no such establishment as a temporary staff to prepare the preliminary records. This measure, was —."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I say, Sir, that this was in existence even when I was the Collector of Tinnevely twelve years ago?"

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"There was no special department employed so far as I know to prepare the register for the survey and settlement parties. So I believe this is a novelty introduced within the last 10 or 15 years and I think there is every justification for cutting down even the whole allotment especially because we are incurring a large expenditure of about 20 lakhs under Survey and Settlement department."

Mr. N. A. V. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI :—"I support this motion, Sir. In my opinion this reduction is a very necessary one in the special circumstances of this year. In normal times we had the policy of temporary establishments. In fact we were thankful to the Government for that as the expenditure was not a permanent recurring one. But now, we must see whether so much is required. We must certainly try and make both ends meet and now we should ask the question whether this year it is possible for us to spare so much amount for the purpose for which the amount is wanted. If there had been a thorough checking over these officers on the work turned out there may be no necessity at all for any work being left in arrears. Now these officers must be asked to give up their habitual love for ease and they must be asked to do their work more expeditiously. As a special case for this year they should be asked to work hard so that they may next year be deserving of better treatment if our finances are ample. This reduction is therefore very reasonable."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I beg also to support the amendment for the reduction. I have listened to the hon. the Revenue Member in support of the demand he made. It is Rs. 1,12,000 in excess of

17th March 1922] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

what was spent last year and he has referred to the fact that the amount spent last year was only less by reason of the fact that the Finance Member has sent round a circular to effect economy in expenditure in the present year. Last year about this time when we could not see any reduction in our incomes during the year we were not called upon to pay quite so liberally as we have been now asked. For, the figure in the budget for last year was 6,55,000 and immediately below that we find a figure of 2 lakhs and odd to be deducted as probable savings. No doubt it comes at the end of the whole of the establishment. Of course there could not be any saving in the permanent establishment; for even when people go on leave they get allowances. So it could only be the probable savings in the temporary establishments. Really what was asked for last year was Rs. 4,02,000. If in a normal year when we did not see any financial stringency an allotment of 4 lakhs was sufficient out of which we were able to save Rs. 50,000, there is no reason why in a lean year like this, which is acknowledged to be a year of very great stringency, we should not limit our expenditure to that of last year instead of exceeding the actual expenditure by 1 lakh. Having regard to the tendency to gradually increase this temporary establishment as well as to the financial stringency I think this motion should be passed."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I may perhaps inform the Council, Sir, that the actual figures for 1920-21 are Rs. 3,75,000 and the revised budget estimate figure for 1922-23 is Rs. 6,55,000. It is quite clear that so far as this is concerned the amount that was budgeted for 1920-21 was Rs. 3,75,000."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"May I ask the hon. Member to look at the next item * 'Temporary additions to pay'? I presume a portion of the Rs. 6,49,000 so classed relates to the same charges."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I do not know all that. It may be temporary or anything else. I prefer to construe these figures in the way in which I do. And I venture to think that Sir Lionel Davidson's construction is not borne out by the fact that there are two entries and the one I referred to is temporary establishment. In the budget estimate for 1921-22 we have Rs. 6,55,000 and it is that we are dealing with. Therefore judged on the facts —."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I thought it was a case of a temporary war allowance which had been merged in pay on the revision of the scale. Probably that is the reason why a corresponding entry of 'temporary additions to pay' does not appear below the item 'temporary establishments' in the budget for 1922-23."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Unless the Home Member is prepared to state that authoritatively, he cannot very well find fault with the hon. Member for making an incorrect statement."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I cannot positively vouch for the explanation I have suggested, but if the suggestion is not taken into account, it is possible that the matter may not be properly appreciated by the House."

* At page 45 of the Civil Budget Estimate for 1921-22.

[17th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ So far as I am concerned, I have been dealing only with these figures, 12-15 p.m. namely, with the actuals of 1920-21 under the head of temporary establishment for this purpose which is Rs. 3.75 lakhs and for the current year, i.e., for 1921-22 Rs. 4 lakhs and odd. Now the hon. the Revenue Member asks the Council to budget for Rs. 5.12 lakhs and therefore he is bound to tell us why he requires an additional sum of Rs. 1 lakh. He has told us that the amount was required for four purposes: firstly, to strengthen the taluk establishments for bringing patta transfers up to date. Naturally it is the work of the permanent staff. If the taluk establishment does not bring up these patta transfers up to date and if they ask for temporary establishment, the Government is too willing to oblige them by giving this temporary establishment, and so there is absolutely no justification for this. Secondly, my hon. friend proceeds to say that it was for strengthening the taluk staff during the heavy kist season. This is also I believe the legitimate work of the taluk establishment and there is absolutely no reason to budget for temporary establishment on this account. Then my hon. Friend proceeded to say that some establishment would be required for distributing loans in famine areas. My hon. Friend will be quite competent to ask for this when there is a likelihood of famine in the year to come and not to budget for temporary establishment for a famine which has not occurred.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“ This establishment will be continued until all the allotments have been distributed and it is calculated that the distribution will not be finished before the 31st March this year.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Do I understand my hon. Friend to say that a part of this temporary establishment is required for the distribution of loans in connexion with famine works which are put down for the next year ? ”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“ We have got the establishment already, Sir, and we are going to continue it.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ That is for famine work which is going to come ? ”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“ I was speaking of the distribution of loans and I did not say anything about the famine work.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ If it is distribution of loans in famine-affected areas, then I do not see any justification for this.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ May I explain, Sir ? I think the position seems fairly clear. A very large number of applications for loans have been received and we cannot discharge the staff which is to dispose of that large number of applications.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ The last item which the hon. the Revenue Member mentioned was that some portion of this temporary establishment is required for bringing up the taluk records in accordance with the settlement proposals. Even with reference to this, I believe in a year such as this my hon. Friend should persuade the taluk

17th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

establishment to do a little more work than they normally do and I think that he would do well to cut out the whole allotment and that if necessary he should come to us with a supplementary estimate budgeting for some temporary establishment. I therefore strongly support this motion for reduction."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I think, I should draw the attention of the House to one figure in the budget. The figures for last year and the year before included the leave allowance and the figures that were quoted by my hon. Friend, which were for both the whole establishment and leave allowance amounted to Rs. 2.78 lakhs in 1919-20 and about Rs. 3.8 lakhs for 1920-21 and in 1921-22 it comes to Rs. 4.02 lakhs. Now the provisions that are sought to be made are Rs. 5.12 lakhs for establishment and Rs. 57,900 for leave allowances. If you take these two together it comes to Rs. 5.70 lakhs. Even comparing this with the provision made in the last year's budget, there is a difference of over Rs. 1.50 lakhs. So, I beg to submit, Sir, that the figure that is sought to be reduced by my hon. Friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao may be easily reduced even if we take into account the figure for the last year. When we have got a stringency and our motive is for making a reduction, I think we can afford to make this reduction."

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"Sir, I am sure the Finance Department has dealt fairly clearly in this matter. As has already been stated a considerable reduction was made under these heads by the Revenue Department, and in view of the financial position, the Finance Department made further considerable reductions to which the Revenue Department reluctantly, and justifiably reluctantly, consented, because there is a limit to reductions when a provision represents measures which are essential in the interests of good administration. So far as one particular item, to which the hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao referred, viz., the question of patta transfers, is concerned it appears to me that one claim which the ryot can make on the Government is that his position in respect of his patta should be made secure. I think it is an undoubted fact that in recent years the number of applications for patta transfers has greatly increased, and it is surely the duty of the State to meet the demand of the ryots under this head. It does in many ways make a great deal of difference to a ryot when his possession of a patta is accurately recorded in the accounts. The main objection that has been urged against the budget provision is however in respect of the work to be done in taluk offices in connexion with the maintenance of village accounts. Here I may say that the entry of temporary establishments in this year's budget does not in the least mean, as some hon. Members seem to think, a measure to give relief to officers who are already there to do the work. It represents additional work that has to be done, but for which the Government have steadily refused to make the establishment permanent on the ground of cheapness, though they have to be carried on from year to year. It is thus a measure of cheapness and not a measure of extravagance. But the work they do is essential if the administrative work of the department is to continue.

"It is asked why these items should not lie over and why we should spend money on them when we are hard up. Having been a Settlement officer myself for many years—I am afraid it is a good many years ago now—I think I can speak with some authority on the amount of work that is cast on the revenue establishments as a result of a resettlement. It is a work that cannot possibly be done by the ordinary establishment. I know personally the amount of work devolving on settlement parties in bringing the village

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[17th March 1922]

accounts up to date and also the immense amount of work that in its turn is cast on the taluk establishment. For this, as I have said, the ordinary permanent establishment is not sufficient.

“Mention has been made of the fact that last year the Revenue Department for some unexplained reason budgeted for a certain sum but was able to cut down its expenditure to 4 lakhs.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“I beg to point out that in the last year the figure was Rs. 6.55 lakhs, but that figure with the reduction of Rs. 2.02 lakhs under probable savings came to 4 lakhs and odd.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“The hon. Member has taken the total of Rs. 2.02 lakhs as probable savings under this head. The saving is under a much larger number of items.”

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“These savings were effected, partially as the hon. the Revenue Member has pointed out, in response to the appeal for retrenchment but they were mainly due to the fact that owing to the state of the season the settlement operations in the Bellary and Anantapur districts were postponed, so that the Finance Department got the benefit not only of the very ready response of the Revenue Department to the appeal for economies but also of the purely accidental causes which led to the postponement of settlement operations. It will however be necessary next year that these settlement operations should be resumed, and we trust that no further seasonal causes will interfere with the work. It will then be necessary to supplement the normal operations of the Settlement department by similar operations on the part of the Revenue establishment. I think the House might accept the assurance of the hon. the Revenue Member that wherever savings are possible they will be effected and I trust the House will not attempt to embarrass the Revenue Department in their efforts to carry out their very necessary operations by refusing the necessary machinery or funds or by forcing them for no good reason to the necessity of coming before this House for further demands from time to time. When the demands on which the existing provision of funds were made, the Finance Department certainly paid due regard to economy on the most rigid lines, but at the same time on financial grounds recognized the need for keeping the revenue accounts and the village accounts up to date. If these operations are postponed, we shall simply be piling up heavy arrears and postponing to a future date heavy unavoidable claims for expenditure on measures, such as resurveys and the revision of adangals and in order to make good later on, we shall be put to the necessity of expenditure on a very much larger scale than the proposals which have been put forward by the Revenue Department.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“Sir, I think it is due to the Council that I should say something in reply to the complaint that has been made of the absence of information in regard to this item as given in the budget. I am not able to plead guilty to the charge that has been made against the Finance Department of supplying no information or flooding the Council with unintelligible statistics by themselves. The Council have before them a budget of about 250 pages. They have printed notes of about 80 pages containing explanations. I have here another volume of nearly a thousand pages of notes on the same matters. I can quote the members of the Finance Committee as witnesses to the fact that I have flooded them with literature, with statistics, with notes, all of which I venture to say they have

17th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

not entirely digested. They have complained on more than one occasion that I have given them more than they had time to digest. Meanwhile we have eliminated lump grants wherever it was possible to do so and in regard to the few that we have had to put in I do venture to urge that the Council should give some weight to the scrutiny of the members of the Finance Committee whom they have constituted their watchdogs over the Finance Department.

"It has been stated that we promised last year to refer lump grants to the Finance Committee and it has been suggested that we did not carry out that promise. I am not going to quote from the proceedings of the Finance Committee, but I may say we printed this volume of 30 pages of notes upon these lump grants and laid them before the Finance Committee, who went through them in detail. I do venture to say to the Council that they have a very efficient body in the Finance Committee and that anything that passes them needs little further examination, and it is rather hard to complain that we are giving them insufficient information when we have given to their elected committee all the information that there is to give.

12-30 p.m. "As regards this one lump grant, the details were in fact among the papers furnished to the Finance Committee. I have here in my hand a list of the temporary staff covering eleven pages of print. The work which they do is of various sorts. I will give just a few instances. One is the man who translates Acts into Oriya in the office of the Collector of Ganjam; another is a man who maintains accounts of transactions connected with village services in proprietary estates. Then there are men who deal with mica work in Nellore."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :— "Does the list refer to the whole temporary establishment?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"This is a list of all the establishments included in this particular lump grant. Besides the staff doing mica work in Nellore there are others doing work in connexion with the enhancement of the peshkash in permanently settled estates, those assisting assistant collectors under training—these will go out as soon as the assistant collectors take charge of regular work, those attending to work under the Madras Estates Land Act, to the localisation of irrigable areas and so on. The list forms a little budget of its own and if I had added every item contained in the list, the bulk of the budget would have been far greater than it is at present. I think the proper people to examine the list are the members of Finance Committee. As I said, I do not know whether they actually examined the list or not. But I may venture to say that we have satisfied them that we are vigilant in the matter of making any reductions that could be made. We have already cut off a large number of the temporary men and if we are going to cut out any more, as Mr. Moir has said, we shall only leave the work undone and pile it up so that when it does have to be done much difficulty will be felt in doing it and probably they may result in a considerable loss of revenue. I have however been through this list again with a view to seeing in the light of the remarks that have been made whether there is any further expenditure that could be postponed. The result of my scrutiny is that we might at a pinch postpone expenditure to the amount of another Rs. 30,000 or Rs. 40,000, but that to do so would seriously cripple the activities of the department."

[17th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu moved the closure which was carried.

The motion was then put and a poll was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 31. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. |
| 2. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu. | 32. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 3. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 33. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 34. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 5. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunachala Mudaliyar. | 35. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari. |
| 6. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 36. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaobharlu. |
| 7. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 37. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishna. | 38. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 39. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 10. Rao Bahadur T. A. Kamalinga Chettiyar. | 40. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 11. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 41. Mr. M. R. Setaratnam Ayyar. |
| 12. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 42. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 13. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 43. Mr. S. Arpudawami Udaiyar. |
| 14. Mr. J. Kuppuswami. | 44. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 15. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 45. Rai Sahib C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| 16. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 46. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 17. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 47. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 18. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 48. Mr. Abbas Ali Khan. |
| 19. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 49. Mr. A. D. M. Bayotti Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | 50. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur-Rahim Sahib Bahadur. |
| 21. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 51. Saiyid Diwan Abd-ul-Razaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 22. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddiyar. | 52. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 23. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | 53. Mr. L. C. Guruswami. |
| 24. Mr. N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai. | 54. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya. |
| 25. Mr. A. Subbarayudu. | 55. Sir M. C. T. Muttayya Chettiyar. |
| 26. Mr. P. Subbarayan. | |
| 27. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | |
| 28. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | |
| 29. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao. | |
| 30. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. |
| 2. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. |
| 3. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. |
| 4. The hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 11. Mr. R. Littlebailes. |
| 5. The hon. Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 12. Mr. E. Periyarayagam. |
| 6. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 13. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| 7. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| | 15. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. |
| | 16. Rao Bahadur T. Namberumal Chettiyar. |

Neutral.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.

The motion was declared carried, 55 voting for and 16 against.

Motions 33 to 42.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—

33. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,12,000 for temporary taluk establishments by 1 lakh.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

34. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,75,190 for taluk establishments by 2 lakhs.

17th March 1922]

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

35. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,25,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 32,000.*

36. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,25,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 32,500.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

37. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,25,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 32,000.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

38. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,25,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 32,500.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

39. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,25,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 32,000.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

40. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,25,000 for travelling allowance by half a lakh.*

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

41. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for 'other contingencies' by Rs. 4,350.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

42. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 44,12,900 for charges of administration by Rs. 18,000.*

Motion 43.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“Sir, I beg to move—

43. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 44,12,900 for charges of administration by Rs. 100.*

“My object, Sir, is that by a redistribution of districts, divisions and taluks it is possible to effect some saving. One of the Members of Government observed that such an undertaking would be no easy task. It is so, I admit, and would be more so if I had asked him to undertake a redistribution of all the districts in the Presidency. But it must be within the hon. Member's knowledge that several new districts have been formed in recent years. New divisions have been added to the old ones and the same remark applies to taluks as well. Surely to revert to an order of things which existed till very few years ago is not quite the same thing as revising the boundaries of districts and divisions all over the Presidency. If we take the central districts alone, I think it will be possible to absorb one district at least. In Bellary district till very recently there were only four divisions, and I think one division has been added on. As regards the taluks, the hon. Member from Cuddapah observed that at least so far as his district was concerned there was one taluk too many. Several taluks have been taken away from Ganjam, Vizagapatam and other districts to form the Agency division. Is it not possible, I would like to know, so far as these three districts are concerned, to re-group them into two? Some of the taluks are really very small.

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

[17th March 1922]

I find the taluk of Proddatur, for instance, in the Cuddapah district consists of 64 villages, excluding 22 inam villages, Kamalapuram, of 62 exclusive of inam villages while the taluks of Dharmavaram and Madakasira in the district of Anantapur have 55 excluding 8 inam villages and 45 excluding 16 inam villages respectively. From my experience, Sir, I should say each of these taluks appears to be too small for one tahsildar to be in entire charge of it. It must be within the knowledge of Government Members that there are many taluks which consist of as many villages as are contained in any two of these. So, I think, Sir, there is a good deal of scope for a reduction in the existing number of taluks. In order to invite the attention of the Government in this direction, I have placed this resolution for the consideration of the House and by endorsing the resolution, the Council will approve of my idea and indicate the line of further action to be taken by the Government."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—

12-45 p.m. "Sir, the only definite answer that I can now give to the hon.

Mover who has brought up this motion will be particularly in regard to the three districts of Ganjam, Vizagapatam and Gōdāvari to which, I think, he made pointed reference as affording opportunities for amalgamation of districts in view of the creation of a separate Agency division. The House will remember that a similar resolution was moved here by my hon. Friend in front of me, Mr. Narasimha Raju, and at that time I gave him the undertaking that I would postpone the bifurcation of the Kistna district and consult the Board of Revenue as to how the three districts named above and the district of Kistna could all be put into the melting pot and what districts of equal size could be carved out. The matter was very carefully considered by the Board of Revenue and it is now under the consideration of Government. So far as that is concerned, Sir, it has not escaped the notice of Government at all.

"As regards the other matter of effecting a redistribution of districts here or amalgamating them there, I think it is a question which I cannot answer off-hand. If it is the intention of the House I would certainly undertake that investigation and try and find out whether there are any taluks in any of the districts which are too many. Of course reference has been made to the Cuddapah district to the effect that that district is one taluk too many. But I may at the same time draw the attention of the House that Kistna district is some taluks too few. It is in any case, Sir, a question which needs, I think, something like a careful investigation, and I shall be glad to do so when opportunity occurs.

"As regards Dharmavaram to which reference was made, Dharmavaram, as the hon. Member himself may know, was originally regarded as a very unhealthy taluk, and it had to be split up into Dharmavaram and Kalyandrug taluks. These two taluks are of recent formation, and we cannot yet say whether the bifurcation was justified or not.

"On the whole, Sir, I shall bear in mind the suggestion made by the hon. Mover, and if there was any possibility of reduction of expenditure, let me assure the House, with all the sincerity that I am capable of, that I have, during the course of the current year, carried out every possible retrenchment, as the figures in the budget will show, and I am actuated by no less a motive of economy than the hon. Members of this House, and if there is any possible source of economy, I promise to the House that I shall not hesitate to effect it."

17th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, the hon. the Revenue Member has made a reference to the redistribution of the Ganjam, Vizagapatam and Gōdāvari districts. I think, Sir, that whatever proposals the hon. the Revenue Member has in regard to these matters, he would do well to publish them before the Government come to any final decision. These are matters of extreme importance."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Under the rules, Sir, all proposals for redistribution of districts or taluks are published in the local gazette for objections, if any, before a final decision is reached."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I am glad to have that assurance, Sir, but I may inform the hon. the Revenue Member that it has been stated that it is proposed to redistribute Kistna in such a manner as to re-transfer some of the taluks of the Gōdāvari western delta to the Gōdāvari district, thus breaking up the unity of the Gōdāvari western delta."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"We need not go into the details now, Sir, inasmuch as I have already stated that the proposals will be published and the House will have an opportunity of considering them."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I do not wish to make any further remarks, Sir, and I should be satisfied if the proposals are published in the gazette before the Government come to any conclusion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, may I in the interest of economy deprecate this proposal? A roving inquiry into the revision of all the district, taluk and divisional limits in the Presidency will inevitably be a very lengthy and expensive matter. In my old district of Madura, the proposals for breaking it up began, I think, in 1901, and they are still arguing about the division of the district. Further than that, I think that anything like a roving enquiry would bring to light grievances all over the Presidency, and that the net result would be pressure on every hand not for reduction in the number of charges but for increase in many directions."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, nobody suggested that all this should be done by a roving enquiry, and so any reference to a roving enquiry is, I think, irrelevant for my purpose. All that I asked this House was to say that the Government should try, wherever it is possible for them to do so, to reduce the number of divisions and taluks. Of course the hon. the Revenue Member says that he will bear that request in mind and do as much as he can. But what possible objection can he have to the House recording that opinion, so that it may be always before him for his guidance? I should like to remind the House in this connection that this is not the old Council where the official majority was always standing against the non-official minority, and I do not see any reason whatsoever why non-official members should hesitate to press their resolutions because now the questions will be decided really by the non-officials of the House. I would rather like that this resolution should go before the House for a division with a view to have an opinion recorded thereon."

The motion was put to the House and lost.

[17th March 1922]

Motion 44.

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

44. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,925 for assistant directors by Rs. 100.*

Motion 45.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I move, Sir—

45. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,925 for controlling office assistant directors by 6,000 (abolition of one out of four posts).*

"First of all, Sir, I may say that the proposed reduction, if it is made, will bring the establishment to what it was during the current year. Reference has been made by the hon. the Revenue Member that though some reductions were agreed upon last year, those reductions could not be made this year. If we look into the figures, we are unfortunately in a very much worse position this year than we were this time last year. The opening balance for the last year was 58 lakhs, and only a small deficit of about 30 lakhs was expected. So that at the time when we were discussing the last year's budget we were under the impression that even granting a deficit of 30 lakhs, we would still have an opening balance. But, unfortunately, things have so far gone very badly, and instead of having some closing balance on hand we are expecting to have a large deficit of a crore of rupees as a result of last year's transactions. Next year, even in spite of about 70 to 80 lakhs by way of additional taxation, we are expecting to have another deficit of 22 lakhs, even without the hon. the Revenue Member's kindly fulfilling his undertaking—I do not say promise—to give increased pay to village headmen. Therefore, it is quite necessary to see that our position next year is not worse, so far as the finances are concerned, than the current year. In the current year there are only three assistant directors, and there is no reason why we should have four during the next year. We are now having an additional post of photographing and printing expert on about Rs. 500 or so, which we did not have during the previous year. So that, strictly speaking, during the last budget discussion, when we reduced one assistant director out of what we had in the previous year, we sanctioned a person on a higher pay. Therefore, if we are going to have the same figure for the coming year also as for the current year, so far as the number of heads are concerned, we will be in the same position in which we were last year. We know that on account of a resolution passed in this House, settlement operations were practically to be very much curtailed and therefore there will be no need to rush on with survey work. After all, we are only dealing with the controlling office, and you will see, Sir, there is also a large sum under temporary establishment of one lakh of rupees lower down. So that if the Government find it absolutely necessary to have an additional hand like this in the controlling office, and if there is extra work, certainly they can take the necessary money out of the one lakh of rupees that has been provided. Therefore it cannot be said that we are going backwards, and the hon. the Revenue Member cannot say that his position will be in any way worse than in the current year. I have put the figure Rs. 6,000 only as a rough estimate, and the reduction can be effected by taking away the new post and not touching any of the old posts. Therefore, Sir, considering

17th March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

that our position in the coming year is financially to be much worse than in the current year, I think the hon. the Revenue Member will agree to this reduction, so that we may have some reductions at least."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
 "It is not the fact, Sir, that any provision has been entered in the next year's budget for an additional officer, but it is merely the entry of provision in the next year's budget for the sanctioned cadre of the Survey Department as approved by the Secretary of State. His sanction extended in respect of 15 officers, as forming the permanent cadre of that Department. They consist of one Director of Survey, two officers at the Central Survey office, ten officers for parties—we have got five parties in operation, and that is at the rate of two officers for each party—and two as leave reserve. In the Central Survey office we have got two officers employed : one is in charge of the office, and the other is called an assistant. The other two officers of whom mention has been made constitute the leave reserve. The one that is now referred to should either be eliminated from the office from among the two who have been there for years past and who, on account of the bulk of the work in that office, cannot be abolished, or the leave reserve sanctioned by the Secretary of State as representing two for the entire cadre should be reduced by one. Neither of these proposals, Sir, is at all feasible. For, it is not the case that I have provided for any additional hand over and above the sanctioned cadre, or that he is intended to meet anything like special emergencies. I think I heard one hon. Member say that in view of a resolution passed by the Legislative Council, all settlement operations have been curtailed. I am at a loss to know which resolution it is that he is referring to. The only resolution that was brought forward before this House, and which was passed, was the one asking us not to give effect to re-settlement schemes pending the passing of legislation on the lines of the Joint Parliamentary Committee's recommendation. The Council has subsequently changed its mind and asked for permanent settlement. One cannot say as to when that would become a realized hope. In the meantime, the settlement operations have to go on. They cannot be suspended in anticipation of a change of policy which is subject to sanction not merely of this Government, but of the Secretary of State as well. We cannot, therefore, halt until that policy is enunciated in due time. The settlement operations have therefore to go on. On the other hand, Sir, during the next year we expect the settlement operations to be in fuller swing than they have been either in the past year or in the current year, because several of the schemes are ready for introduction in the next year and the work must thus go apace. I repeat that this officer to whom reference has been made is intended to constitute the leave reserve sanctioned by the Secretary of State.

"Inasmuch as on the strength of the sanction accorded by the Secretary of State to the full cadre to be employed in the Survey Department we have filled up the places, the officer is there now doing his duty. What are we to do with him? He has been absorbed as part of the permanent establishment. Orders on this matter were issued by the Madras Government and published through the Publicity Bureau for the information of the public in this province. One of the paragraphs in that order which was published through the Publicity Bureau refers to the scheme sanctioned by the Secretary of State. It stated that the strength of the Survey Department will be fifteen officers, viz., one Director

1 p.m.

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [17th March 1922]

of Survey, two officers of the Central Survey office, ten officers for the five survey parties, two officers on leave reserve with the addition of two officers on a temporary basis for the control of the sixth party. This information as I stated was published for the information of the public through the Publicity Officer on the 22nd August 1921. The full staff is now under employment and I ask which of these officers should now go. If you are going to abolish any one of these officers are you not going to incur the liability of paying compensation to him as we have appointed him permanently under the orders of the Secretary of State? Then, Sir, what is the real situation? The two reserve officers are always engaged to take up the place of officers who go on leave. When any officer goes on leave the officer who is borne on the leave reserve is posted to take up that work without any additional expenditure. Viewed from any standpoint, the carrying out of the proposal appears on the face of these facts rather impossible. Therefore I am sorry I cannot accept it."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"As one who has given notice of a similar motion, I submit that the reasons given by the hon. the Revenue Member are not at all satisfactory. He says that for a cadre of fifteen gentlemen there should be two persons to serve as leave reserve."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"I did not say there should be. That is the sanctioned strength fixed by the Secretary of State."

Mr S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—"May I know whether the sanction of the Secretary of State is for leave reserve? Is it not possible to utilize the services of the other officers?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"I am not prepared for a cross-examination on this point."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I submit, Sir, that the two persons are quite unnecessary. One is quite enough. If the officer had been appointed already in August, I think, Sir, the Government have appointed him knowing that the sanction of the Council is necessary for the employment of that additional officer. Therefore it is not an answer to say that the man is already employed and therefore let him continue. Then I have got another doubt. Supposing these officers are there, what are these two reserve officers doing?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I point out that there are two officers on leave? Therefore there is nobody supernumerary now at all."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"It is the keeping of these two officers that tempt others to go on leave. Therefore if you keep one only, one at a time will go on leave. At a time when we are pinched very much by want of money I think, Sir, for a small department like that to have two officers for the leave reserve is a little extravagant. I therefore submit that we can get on with one of them for the coming year. It is said that we have to give compensation allowance for them if they were to go. I say it is not at all necessary; because they could easily be reverted to the departments from which they were taken. I therefore submit that it is quite unnecessary to have these additional gentlemen here for the current year."

17th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ In view of what the hon. the Revenue Member has said, I think the Council will be well advised in voting against this motion. The hon. the Revenue Member has explained at length the reason for this one additional appointment that has been made, and after all it is only one appointment that has been made. No doubt my friend Mr. T. M. Narasimbacharlu says that the Government knowing that the sanction of the Council was necessary for this appointment ought not to have made it in anticipation of the Council's sanction. No doubt in the abstract it is a very sound argument. If, on a consideration of the merits of the question, we now find that the appointment was really unnecessary, then, though it has been made, it is open to this Council to vote against it. But on a consideration of the merits of the question, the appointment is a sound one. So that there is no harm in Government having anticipated the sanction of the Council. I think, Sir, there is no need to cancel this appointment and therefore this motion in the interest of public services may be voted against.”

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—“ I find in page 37 of the budget that there is an increase of three assistant directors and not one. Further we were told that two officers were placed as leave reserve officers. I think it is really too much. At this rate each department should have hundreds of officers as reserve officers. I think the reduction of one assistant director is reasonable.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I should not have interfered in this debate but for the fact that the hon. the Revenue Member alluded to settlements. He said, Sir, that this Council did pass a resolution that schemes of resettlement should not be introduced or given effect to pending legislation on the lines indicated in the report of the Joint Committee. Then he went on to say that the House had changed its mind as regards that by a subsequent resolution regarding permanent settlement. Is he really serious, Sir, in saying that because the House passed the second resolution it had changed its mind as regards the first, viz., that resettlement schemes should not be brought into operation till satisfactory legislation was carried out. If the hon. the Revenue Member feels that he could not bring a permanent settlement Bill, the only alternative left to him is to bring his original Bill as a temporary measure. I do not think it right that the opinion of the House deliberately expressed should be treated in the way—I think, somewhat light way—which the hon. the Revenue Member proposes to do.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I will be very brief, Sir. At the time of the last budget on account of the figures given by the Government themselves the number was reduced to three and probably to use the words of the hon. the Revenue Member, it was not fair to the House to have the number increased to four. Now, is it fair for the hon. Member to have introduced another one in the course of the year without consulting the House? He says : I have got it according to the list of the sanctioned cadre. I request Government Members not to refer to the sanctioned cadre at all. It was fixed at a time of panic. If only all the sanctioned appointments were made you will have to spend on appointments 12 crores of rupees. So far as the leave reserves and other things are concerned if you take the quarterly civil list you will see that there are more persons in reserve than is necessary to act for persons going on leave.

[Mr. C. V Venkataramana Ayyangar] [17th March 1922]

Therefore if one person is not found sufficient to cover the leave reserve at any time, one appointment may be vacant for a short time. There is one other thing. There is the danger of having too much of leave reserves. Take, for instance, the Forest Department. If you see the quarterly list you will see that there are a number of persons without work and you will see that there are a number of people shown as assisting others because there is no vacancy for them to fill temporarily. In a year which was fairly better the House and the Government thought that three people would be sufficient. To say because it comes within the sanctioned cadre we appointed him and you should shut your mouth is not in the least fair. Therefore I will press this motion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I explain the technical points in this motion, Sir? First of all, I should like to say that if the hon. Member who has just now spoken will come to my room and show me the names of the officers who have no work to do, I will show him what work they have been doing."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I never said that they are without any work. They will be put in as assistants to some officers."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"The only department in which I think, there is anything like an excess is the Public Works Department and that is due to the special orders passed by the Secretary of State which makes a man an Executive Engineer after a certain number of years' service whether there is a charge ready for him or not. That is by the way. In the other departments, I think you will find generally that there is a shortage of officers. May I say with regard to this particular case that the proposals for the revision of the survey establishment has been under consideration since the year 1914, when Mr. Stuart's Committee sat? The number of officers sanctioned in the old scale was 17 altogether, of whom 2 were probationers and 15 permanent men. The staff was short for several years. The Superintendent of Survey then wrote to the Government saying that his department had been on the verge of a breakdown for a number of years past and that it was a matter of great anxiety to him to know how he was to carry on the work when there were a number of senior officers retiring without anybody coming on to take their places. Proposals were then sent to the Secretary of State and his sanction to a revision scheme was received in 1921, so that what is happening is that we are applying the sanction given to proposals which were before him at the time when the reforms came into force. If I recollect rightly, these have been placed before the Finance Committee and there is a further note which has yet to come before them. There has thus been no attempt to put into the budget sanctions for appointment without coming before the Council for the exercise of their powers in the matter. At the same time, there has been no increase in the number of appointments. There has been simply a revision of the pay of the men employed. There are two temporary men actually employed, whom the Secretary of State recruited because they are needed for employment on estate work. Three men are now employed on estate surveys and are paid by the estates. That, I hope, will to some extent reconcile the Council to this provision, because on account of these three men there is no payment of provincial revenue. As regards the provision for a leave reserve, I shall be very glad to show to the hon. Member the authority for the calculation on which it is based. That is worked out upon the average amount, not on the total amount, of leave the officers can

17th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

take. If the leave reserve were reduced by half, that would mean reducing by half the amount of leave to which officers are entitled."

1-15 p.m.

A poll was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 21. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. |
| 2. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu. | 22. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 3. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 23. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 4. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 24. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimbacharlu. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 25. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishna. | 26. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| 7. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 27. Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. Rama Rao. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 28. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 9. Mr. K. Kandaswami Kandar. | 29. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 10. Mr. J. Kuppuswami. | 30. Sriman Sasi Ebushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 11. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 31. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 12. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Panja. | 32. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 13. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | 33. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 14. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | 34. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 15. Mr. N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai. | 35. Mr. A. D. M. Bayotti Sahib. |
| 16. Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 36. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rabim Khan Sahib. |
| 17. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | 37. Sayid Diwan Abdul Razaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 18. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | |
| 19. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao. | |
| 20. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 12. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| 2. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 13. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 3. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 14. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. |
| 4. The hon. Mr. P. Ramaravaniyar. | 15. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. |
| 5. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 16. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. |
| 6. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 17. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 7. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 18. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari. |
| 8. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 19. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar. |
| 19. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | 20. Mr. Abbas Ali Khan. |
| 10. Mr. R. Littlehales. | 21. Mr. M. C. Raja. |
| 11. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. | 22. Mr. L. C. Guruswami. |
| | 23. Rao Bahadur T. Namburumal Chettiyar. |

The motion was carried and the reduction made, 37 voting *for* and 23 *against*.

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"I beg to submit that the arrangement made in regard to making these motions presents some difficulty. The items are not arranged either in the order of pages of the budget or in the order of their receipt. At page 8 there is my motion No. 116 for the reduction of the total allotment of Rs. 11,02,800 for survey and settlement. If this item is taken up first, it will be very easy to dispose of the minor items, instead of voting on all the smaller items first and then going to the bigger item."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I fear I cannot just now engage in a discussion on the proper form of the agenda with the hon. Member. If the hon. Member puts in writing what he has to say, I will carefully examine the question. Under the standing orders the preparation of the agenda is in the hands of the Secretary, who acts according to well-understood rules. Till it is shown that the Secretary has wrongly exercised his discretion, we must take his procedure to be right. In any case, it is not a matter to be discussed now."

[17th March 1922]

Motions 46 to 52.

The following motions fell through, being identical with the previous one which has been disposed of:—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

46. *To omit one assistant director out of four.*

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

47. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,925 for four assistant directors by Rs. 5,230.*

The following motions were not made:—

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

48. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for charge allowances.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

49. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for charge allowances.*

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

50. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 27,822 for managers by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

51. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,00,000 for temporary establishments in revenue survey and settlement by Rs. 50,000.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

52. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,236 for personal allowance under lithographic department.*

Motion 53.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“Sir, I beg to move formally—

53. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,07,394 for establishments by Rs. 20,000.*

“I thought that this would only be a necessary corollary to one officer being taken away. The Council has passed the previous motion to reduce the number of officers by one. So I think his establishment also must go away. So I have asked for a reduction of Rs. 20,000 which is only one-tenth of the total allotment.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—

“I am sorry, Sir, that it is presumed that when the officer goes, necessarily some of the establishment which is imagined to exist under him also goes. I think the Council has definitely come to the conclusion that one of the four officers in the Central Survey office should be abolished. Two are in charge of the office and the other two on the leave reserve. It is not known whether one of the two officers falling under the category of those in charge of the Central Survey office or one of the two officers falling under the other category, should go. Neither of them when he goes will carry any establishment along with him. If one officer goes, the other officer will remain in charge of the Central Survey office and the whole establishment will have to remain. Similarly, the officers on leave reserve have no separate

17th March 1922] [Mr. Muhammad.Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

establishments under them. When their acting period is over, the officers in question revert to the Central Survey office and there is thus practically nothing to go away along with either of the officers who will have to go according to the decision of the Council."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I do not press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 54.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" Sir, I beg to move—

54. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 500.*

" This amount is provided at page 37 of the Budget. Sir, this House has passed a resolution that the Government Order fixing the higher rate of travelling allowances should be modified and that reduced rates should be introduced. The hon. the Finance Member tells us that out of 73 lakhs forming the travelling allowances, he has reduced an amount of 10 lakhs of rupees. We want, Sir, that in accordance with the resolution that we have passed, a definite reduction must be made in the travelling allowances provided for first-class officers. Now against this item we find that in 1920-21 the amount was Rs. 4,600 which is the revised estimate, the budget estimate being Rs. 5,600. In the budget for 1922-23 Rs. 5,000 is provided. There is absolutely no reduction whatever. I only move that this House may cut it down by one-tenth. The Finance Member, no doubt, has told us, that he has reduced the travelling allowance of 73 lakhs by 10 lakhs. But we want more reduction. The resolution which we have passed recommends 25 per cent of reduction, which comes to 18 lakhs. I hope the House will adhere to the opinion which it has already passed and accept this motion."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—

1-30 p.m. " Sir, I understood the hon. Member to say that he is not at all very serious as regards the actual reduction which he has proposed. I assume that he will not press this motion inasmuch as the item referred to is after all so trifling that it will mean nothing either one way or the other. He probably raised this question with a view to find out what the Government intend to do on the question of travelling allowances as a whole. I think it is far beyond my own province to say anything definitely on that matter, for it is a matter which the hon. the Finance Member will have to deal with. But I merely invite the attention of the House to the speech of the hon. the Finance Member while introducing the budget for 1922-23. I would invite the attention of the House particularly to paragraph 18 of the speech where he has dealt with the question of travelling allowances exhaustively. The hon. the Finance Member says—

' Accordingly the matter was laid before the Finance Committee with a view to concrete suggestions in the month of December, and it has been an item on the agenda ever since. The following concrete suggestions have been made :—

- ' (1) that the mileage rates of officers of the first-class be reduced from twelve to ten annas ;
- ' (2) that no officer should be allowed more than two railway tickets either in the first or in the second-class ; and
- ' (3) that the daily allowance of Rs. 10 and Rs. 7-8-0 should be reduced to Rs. 7-8-0 and Rs. 5.'

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [17th March 1922]

“The hon. the Finance Member finally winds up by saying—

‘The question is a very complicated one, and the proposals have not yet taken final shape, but I hope to have them ready for submission to the Finance Committee at their next meeting.’

“Therefore, Sir, the matter regarding, the rates of travelling allowance to be paid to officials, whether gazetted or non-gazetted, is engaging the attention of the Finance Member, and he hopes to seek the assistance of the Finance Committee as regards that question. In what direction the change is likely to be effected one cannot definitely say at the present moment. The rates that have been followed in the next year's budget are the rates that are now current. As regards the amount of Rs. 5,000 entered on behalf of the Director of Survey, I wish to point out that the Director of Survey has at the present moment the responsibility of supervising eight survey parties—five of them are permanent, one is temporary specially created for the Malabar and the Wynad, and two others have been specially created for the purpose of carrying on the surveys in estates. The Director of Survey is bound under the rules to visit every survey party not less than once a month, and he has to visit oftener if any question of importance occurs which necessitates his personal inspection. He has thus to travel throughout the province. He has necessarily to go personally to all districts where survey parties exist. He is not merely confined to headquarters; he has often to go on tour, in some cases to inspect the accuracy of the work done and check such work actually in the field, in several cases he has to go into the interior parts of the districts. The Director of Survey is an officer with presidency jurisdiction, and his duties are such as to demand almost a meticulous inspection of varieties of details which the survey party is responsible for, and under such circumstances the sum entered cannot at all be considered extravagant.”

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—“Sir, I am obliged to the hon. the Revenue Member for drawing the attention of the House to paragraph 18 of the hon. the Finance Member's budget speech. I would also invite the attention of the House to certain passages in the same book and certain other passages occurring elsewhere over the signature of the hon. the Finance Member. I support this motion for reduction by 10 per cent because a principle is involved in this, and I think the principle ought to be accepted by the House. Though the amount involved in the motion is only Rs. 500, yet if the principle is recognized, we shall probably get a very large sum of money which will enable us to square the deficit—I am using the words with a full sense of consciousness of what they mean. For in a paper which has been given to us in the Finance Committee on 8th December 1921, it was stated that travelling allowances and contingencies in all departments—.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“I wish to know, Sir, whether the hon. Member is in order in quoting a paper which was given to him in the Finance Committee and which has not been laid before the House.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—“I should like to point out to the hon. the Finance Member that every hon. Member of the Indian Legislative Assembly gets a copy of the proceedings of the Finance Committee along with the budget and other papers during the discussion of the Financial statement in the Assembly. In the present instance my hon. Friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, in discussing this motion for reduction, wants to supplement his discussion by information which ought to be

17th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

published to this House. If that information is given the discussion will be much more satisfactory than at present. As it is the hon. the Finance Member was reading from his notes whatever portion he liked."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, it was just because that objection was taken to my reading from my notes that I objected to other people reading from papers which had not been laid before the House."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Under what rule was the Finance Committee appointed?"

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"It is not appointed under any rule or standing order."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think the Finance Committee has been appointed under a resolution of this House. I am speaking from memory. I believe the bulk of the members have been elected by the House, and that a few, who were also members, have been nominated by the Government. The Finance Committee is a committee of this House. Unless I hear cogent reasons to the contrary, I should not be prepared to give a ruling that the proceedings of the Finance Committee, which is a committee of this House, should be as it were a sealed book to the House. Some of the hon. Members, I fear, are confusing this matter with the ruling that I gave the other day that public documents should not be referred to by members of the Government unless the Government are prepared to place them on the table."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"No, Sir, unless they are of a confidential nature."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think I stated that it was open to any hon. Member to object to a public document being referred to without the same being placed or offered to be placed on the table of the House. I also stated the other day—it was with reference to the hon. the Home Member—that there was nothing to prevent the Member from using a document of a confidential nature without actually reading from that document. Now, I do not go back upon that ruling, namely, that public documents, if they are to be quoted by the Government and relied upon by the Government, should, in all fairness to the House, be made available to the latter. I do not think that I have even passed a ruling that proceedings of the Finance Committee should be treated as an ordinary public document in the sense that it should be laid on the table of the House if it is to be relied upon."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Might I ask that the question whether the proceedings of the Finance Committee should be placed before the House should be deferred? It is a large question on which there are precedents on both sides, and I should venture to deprecate any attempt to decide the question off-hand. Why I took the present point of order is this: On a previous occasion, I began to read a statement made by the hon. Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar in the Finance Committee, and the hon. Mr. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu objected to my reading therefrom on the ground that the note had not been placed before the House. You ruled me out of order, Sir. In the present instance, another member of the Finance Committee is reading from another paper placed before the Finance Committee and not placed before the House. Pending any decision on the main question I venture to think that your previous ruling holds good."

[17th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I remember the incident which occasioned my previous ruling. I believe that, when the hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao objected to the hon. the Finance Member reading from the proceedings of the Finance Committee, the hon. the Finance Member immediately accepted that objection. He accepted it off-hand, and did not wait for a ruling from me supporting the hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao. That is my recollection. We can refer to the matter later on; let me say that I entirely agree with the hon. the Finance Member that I should not decide off-hand under the impulse of the moment, nor should the House ask me to do so. I cannot off-hand pass a ruling as to the position of the Finance Committee, whether its proceedings should be treated as confidential and should be kept from the House or whether the House could not insist upon the proceedings being made available to it. The Finance Committee is not, after all, a departmental body, but it is only a committee of this House. This is a wide and difficult question which has to be carefully considered. I would advise the House not to go into the question just now, and I would also beg of the House not to ask me to go into the question now. But it would be difficult for us, as we are dealing with the finances of the province, to enforce any ruling to the effect that the Finance Committee should not be quoted. If I remember aright, during the course of the discussion of several motions to-day, the proceedings of the Finance Committee were quoted—constantly quoted—by hon. Members, including, if I may venture to say so, the hon. the Finance Member."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I have scrupulously endeavoured only to quote speeches of members of the Finance Committee made in this House in which they have confirmed the decisions that have been come to in the Finance Committee."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"If I remember aright this morning the hon. Member showed a document of several printed pages which, he said, related to temporary establishments. He said: 'Here is a list of temporary establishments'."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I scrupulously avoided quoting that document, Sir. I merely demonstrated the existence of such a document."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. the Finance Member, if I remember aright, quoted from the document."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"No, Sir, I merely showed it to the Council as evidence of what had been done."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member anyhow exhibited the document before the eyes of the House; he referred to the contents of the document which was in his possession. In certain instances he did quote from the document. Apparently he wanted the House to take note of the fact that he was in possession of such a document. The hon. Member Mr. Krishnan Nayar also corroborated the hon. the Finance Member. Now, I am not going just now into the question whether it was right or wrong to have quoted from that document or to have exhibited that document. I am simply saying this with reference to the question how far the proceedings of the Finance Committee should be treated as confidential, that it is a very wide question, and I would earnestly beg of the House not to rush me or itself into any decision on the question. By all means let the question be fairly and fully considered."

17th March 1922]

The Council then adjourned for lunch at 1-45 p.m. and re-assembled after lunch at 2-35 p.m.

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I will begin by thanking you for the ruling you have given in the matter. Apart from all questions of technical consideration I should have thought that the hon. the Finance Member would have been anxious not to conceal under a bushel the light that is to be found in the document, and would have wished to be set on house-tops to be seen by all. This is what he has attempted to do—

'In all departments, it is proposed to effect reductions on the amount of expenditure on travelling allowances and contingencies. It is proposed to instruct all officers that travelling must be limited to cases of necessity and to restrict their charges to 75 per cent of those for the current year; and it is proposed to make a 25 per cent reduction also in contingencies in all cases. In addition to this, it is proposed to resume the savings that have accrued under contract grants. It is also proposed to suspend all discretionary grants to Collectors (1.25 lakhs per annum) until times improve.'

"In the margin to that note, it is stated that the travelling allowances amount to Rs. 62 lakhs, and contingencies amount to Rs. 120 lakhs, and that the proposed saving of 25 per cent from both these heads amounts to 45 lakhs. That is what has been promised, and I believe my hon. Friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar has also several times stated in the Council that the hon. the Finance Member has made a promise of effecting a saving of 45 lakhs under the two heads. In the Finance Member's statement presented to this House we have in paragraph 9—

'Finally, we have cut down drastically a number of charges other than those for establishments, such as travelling allowances and contingencies, for 1922-23. The net reduction under these heads amounts to 23.14 lakhs.'

"So any reduction under the head which the hon. House may pass will mean an addition to the reduction of 23.14 lakhs only made by the Finance Member in the Budget. Sir, my complaint is that the reduction of 45 lakhs that was promised at the December meeting of the Finance Committee, if it had been fully given effect to, would have given us 21 lakhs or 22 lakhs, nearly, more than the amount of reduction effected here. If 22 lakhs had been available to us in the manner that it should have been made available as promised, 75 per cent or 80 per cent of the deficit with which we are faced would have been wiped off. Therefore, Sir, we as members of the Finance Committee had some papers placed before us, and so far as these papers are concerned what has been placed before us has been read and digested by us, our complaint is that what has been promised at one stage has not been carried out in the budget stage. If what has been stated was given effect to we should have been richer by 22 lakhs. Therefore, as a matter of principle, we should cut down travelling allowances by about 20 lakhs. 23.14 lakhs referred to in the Financial Statement represents a reduction of 13 per cent only, and if the reduction of 10 per cent proposed by Mr. Muniswami Nayudu is given effect to, this would bring the reduction to about 25 per cent, which was promised, and which we and the hon. the Finance Member think it is possible. In that way we can bridge over the deficit. Therefore I request the House to support the motion for reduction."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, as I said already the decrease of Rs. 500 by itself does not amount to much, nor do I think that the House is of opinion that when they cut down Rs. 500 they would be achieving anything like an appreciable reduction in

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [17th March 1922]

the total expenditure. The whole issue was raised on the question of the general principles affecting travelling allowances. The hon. the Finance Member has explained at length the attempts at reduction in that direction. I have in any case listened with great interest to the speeches relating to the general principle, and I shall certainly bear them in mind when the question of revising the travelling allowances of the departments under my control comes up to me. I do not think Mr. Muniswami Nayudu intends pressing his motion to a division if I tell him that I shall bear in mind the various facts urged by him."

MR. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"The hon. the Revenue Member has stated that it is not the amount to be reduced that mattered but the principle underlying it. I agree. It is our duty to cut down the allotment in spite of the promise of the hon. the Revenue Member to investigate the case."

The motion was then put to the vote and carried.

Motion 55.

2-45 p.m.

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

55. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,800 for house-rent allowance.*

"Mr. President, if we take into account the travelling allowances that are paid to these four or five officers the total cost comes to Rs. 39,500. If we total up the other allowances given to these officers the total comes to Rs 7,500. That is, they draw nearly 20 per cent of their pay as allowances. It is very undesirable. There is no reason why these officers whose salaries were recently enhanced should draw extra allowances which are not sanctioned by the Secretary of State. Therefore, I propose to omit this allotment of Rs. 1,800. I suppose it is for the assistant directors incharge of survey parties."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
"The allowance that finds place in the Budget is in respect of an officer who is going to be recruited in England as a lithographic expert. He has not yet been taken on. The Secretary of State is recruiting an officer on our behalf. The terms of appointment were fixed long ago. For the last two years and more, the Secretary of State has been trying to secure an expert, and not having been able to do so on our terms, he suggested to us the desirability of securing the help of the Survey of India Department, and of also asking the Military Department if, after the termination of the war, any officer could be available. We went round through all those stages but we were not able to secure any officer at all. Eventually, we have again asked the Secretary of State to recruit one for us. He has not selected any yet. This allowance is intended to be paid to him. The idea is to bring him only for a temporary period. It is not a permanent appointment that we are offering. We are bringing him down on a temporary basis. In the meantime, we are sending out an Indian from Madras to England on a scholarship to undergo training there. As soon as he is trained there and returns to India, this officer's services would be done away with."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"Is it one of the terms of the agreement that he should be paid house-rent?"

17th March 1922]

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
“Otherwise the salary that we have offered is so low that no officer would be willing to come from England on a temporary basis for a small salary like this.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“I withdraw the motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 56.

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

56. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,500 for Presidency allowance 3(100) (60).*

“Sir, I need not argue much. The salaries of these officers were recently enhanced, and at that time all these conditions were taken into consideration. Wherever they are posted they are bound to serve. So any special treatment is unnecessary. Therefore I move for this omission.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
“I am sorry, Sir, it is not quite correct to say that the salaries of these officers have been enhanced; for the question of the enhancement of the salaries of the officers serving in the Survey Department is now in the hands of the Finance Committee. We sent up proposals for the reorganization of the Survey Department to the Secretary of State. But, before we got his orders, the new Council came into operation. We were advised to consult the new Council before finally asking for sanction of the scale which we propose to recommend on behalf of the Survey Department. But, before it is laid for the sanction of the House, we have placed it before the Finance Committee, and the Finance Committee will scrutinize it and eventually the scheme will come up before the House. It is not quite correct to say that the pay of the officers of the Survey Department has been revised on the lines of the revision which took place in other departments. I would therefore press for the continuance of this Presidency allowance, because the four officers who are serving in Madras would probably be better off if they were employed in the mufassal. I do not want to repeat the arguments which my hon. Friend said he was already familiar with in support of such allowances. These allowances are based on the salaries which the officers draw. A higher salary has a lower allowance. Thus Rs. 60 is intended for officers who draw over Rs. 700, and Rs. 100 for officers who draw below Rs. 700. At present, in connexion with the scheme to which reference was made by the hon. the Finance Member, the cadre of this department was fixed by the Secretary of State, and the personal allowances form part and parcel of it. Will it be equitable that we should now think of depriving them of this personal allowance? When we are considering the whole question of salaries we must consider the question of personal allowances also.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting this motion. This question of Presidency allowance is a very old one. It has been based on the expenses which are necessarily incurred by the officers transferred to the city. These allowances have no justification whatever at present, whatever the reasons may have been for giving them in the beginning. At the present moment, the conditions in the mufassal are also similar. In several places they are not what they were years ago. On the other hand there are compensating advantages for the

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [17th March 1922]

people in the city. Some officers like city life, and so they want to come to Madras. There are people who want to educate their sons, and there are also people who want to come to the city for other reasons as well. So in the case of persons who are transferred to the city, all these advantages are available to them, and any additional Presidency allowance is unnecessary. They are not under any disadvantage at all. As a matter of principle, I very strongly support the motion before the House."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" I would also like to support the motion for the omission of the Presidency allowance. As has been pointed out, there are special compensations and advantages in Madras. So it is not necessary that we should give them any additional advantage in the shape of Presidency allowance."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" It seems to me that the discussion is trenching on the general issue of Presidency allowances. I do not propose to discuss that myself, but I do deprecate very much any attempt to settle such an issue in a discussion in which speeches are limited to 10 minutes and five minutes. We all know there are some officers who would willingly come and serve in the Presidency town without any allowances. These officers however are, I venture to think, exceptions. In the case of Indian officers, the chief attraction is ordinarily the educational advantages of the Presidency town, when they come to reside there with their families. In the case of the European officers that inducement is absent. It is not my desire to introduce any question of racial distinction, but I must say that in the case of European officers, it is often a very great hardship indeed to be posted to the City of Madras for service on the same scale of pay as that to which they would be eligible in the mufassal, and, particularly during the past two years owing to the rise in rents, officers have protested against being posted to or retained in the City of Madras, on the ground that they cannot make both ends meet. This is not an idle complaint. I can well recall the conditions in which, as a young officer in the Secretariat, as assistant secretary, as under secretary, and as secretary to the Board of Revenue, I myself served in the City of Madras on a scale of remuneration much the same as that which I might have drawn upcountry, sometimes less and sometimes a little more; even in the nineties, it was most difficult for a young married officer with one or two children to make both ends meet in the City of Madras. There is no question that a Presidency allowance in cases of this description was a real necessity. I am speaking now of what the facts were in the nineties. It is common knowledge to most of us in this House how great has been the difference in the cost of living since the nineties. It is particularly large in the case of house-rent, but in other directions also it is large. Though it is the fashion to talk of the enormous increases which have been made in the salaries of the gazetted officers, there has in fact not been much real increase. I do not want to generalise but merely to speak of my own service which is generally spoken of as the most over-paid service, and I can only say that the increase in the cost of living in the Presidency town since I was here as a young officer twenty or thirty years ago has been such as entirely to outweigh the additions to pay which the officers in similar positions have received. I should say the extra cost is at least double, and I should not be far wrong if I said it was three times the increase in pay. It is within my personal knowledge that young officers on being posted to Madras have the

17th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

utmost difficulty in keeping out of debt. This discussion being based on speeches abbreviated of necessity by the conditions of time, I should be very loth to commit the House to any general proposition that Presidency allowances ought to be abolished. It is not an issue which ought to be decided off-hand. For the decision carries serious consequences and it would not be fair to ask young officers to come and serve in the City under such great disadvantages. On these grounds I oppose the motion."

The motion was put to the House and carried.

The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson demanded a poll and the same was taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 25. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. |
| 2. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu. | 26. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao. |
| 3. Rao Sahib E. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 27. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 28. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 29. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 6. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 30. Sriman Biswanatha Das Mahasayo. |
| 7. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 31. Mr. S. Muttumasioka Achari. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 32. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimbachari. |
| 9. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 33. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 10. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 34. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 11. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 35. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 12. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 36. Sriman Sasi Bhagshana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 13. Mr. J. Kappuswami. | 37. Mr. M. R. Seturathnam Ayyar. |
| 14. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 38. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 15. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 39. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 16. Mr. V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 40. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampam. |
| 17. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 41. Mr. Hamid Sultan Marakattayar Sahib. |
| 18. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 42. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib. |
| 19. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | 43. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur-Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 44. Manshi Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Sahib. |
| 21. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | 45. Khan Sahib Sayyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 22. Mr. N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai. | |
| 23. Dr. P. Subbarayan. | |
| 24. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 11. Mr. R. Littlehales. |
| 2. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 12. Mr. E. Periyaravagam. |
| 3. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-Jah Sahib Bahadur. | 13. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| 4. The hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 5. The hon. Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 15. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 6. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 16. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar. |
| 7. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 17. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 18. Mr. M. Katnaswami. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 19. The Zamindar of Mandasa. |
| 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | 20. Mr. R. T. Kesavalu Pillai. |

The motion was carried, 45 voting *for* and 20 *against*.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I would point out to hon. Members that, as against a total number of 200 motions, we have thus far done only 59, and we are supposed to finish the balance before a particular hour in the evening. I would appeal to hon. Members who have got motions to make to be as brief as possible. I would also request them not to repeat their arguments. There must be some sense of proportion in these things. I trust hon. Members would recognize that it is in their best interests that I appeal to them not to waste time in repeating what others have said and to be as brief as possible in what they have to say."

[17th March 1922]

Motions 57 to 59.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

57. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,500 for Presidency allowance.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

58. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,500 for Presidency allowance.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

59. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,500 for Presidency allowance by Rs. 720.*

Motion 60.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I do not move the motion standing in my name which is as follows :—

60. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 55,200 for assistant directors by Rs. 12,000. (Abolition of two out of ten posts.)*

“ The reason why I gave notice of this was that in 1920–21 there were only seven assistant directors. It was increased to 8 in 1921–22 and now they want to make it 10. This year they have also got an addition of two temporary posts. This was the reason why I gave notice of this motion. In view, however, of the general reduction that is coming on at the end and in view of your advice, Sir, I do not want to move this resolution.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ May I point out to Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar that the House would have been more pleased if he had not made that little speech. I think it is well understood that an hon. Member need not state reasons for not moving his motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 61 to 68.

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

61. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 55,200 for ten assistant directors by Rs. 11,400.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

62. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for charge allowance for assistant directors.*

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

63. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for two probationers in survey and settlement.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

64. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 5,400 for personal allowances to probationers.*

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

65. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4.10 lakhs for temporary establishment.*

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

66. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,10,000 for provisional survey parties—temporary establishments by Rs. 1,10,000.*

17th March 1922]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

67. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,19,300 for subordinates including temporary establishments by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

68. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 17,188.*

Motion 69.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—“ I move, Sir,

69. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 9,000.*

“ Sir, I do not repeat the arguments already advanced. I hope the House will accept the motion.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
“ For the reasons that I have already given, Sir, I am sorry I cannot accept this recommendation also. I do not think that it is the intention of any hon. Member that we should curtail the travelling facilities of officers who have got to keep moving about their jurisdiction from time to time, and particularly at a time like this, when we are expecting all our officers to be always on the move, any attempt to reduce their travelling allowances would be suicidal. In this case in particular, Sir, the travelling allowance is asked in respect of survey parties. We have got, as I have already mentioned, five permanent survey parties, one special party for the West Coast and two for estates work. It is for the travelling allowance of all these eight survey parties that I have budgeted for this sum. The provision made in the budget for this purpose is far less than what the Board of Revenue has demanded. I have already exercised economy in this direction, and to reduce the allotment still further would merely mean that the parties will neglect their work of inspection and the superior officers will remain at their headquarters and the volume of work that would be turned out will be simply nominal. If the House is prepared for this unfortunate result, let them vote for the reduction.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ Sir, I do not wish to take up much time of the House in view of your intention. I request hon. Members on the Government Bench to recognize the accepted principle, expedite these survey proceedings and try to meet us half way as it were. The principle has been gone into fully and there is no use asking us to reconsider the matter. I request the hon. the Revenue Member not to go to a division.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
“ In this particular case, I am sorry I cannot accept any reduction. As regards the other case where the House has passed a reduction of Rs. 500 the reasons that I could have urged for the retention of Rs. 500 were not as forcible as these. It is not the allotment which was definitely asked for by the departments. Although much larger amount is necessary for the inspecting officers of eight parties, I have deliberately cut it down to the very bone and I regret I cannot go further.”

The motion was put to the House and carried.

[17th March 1922]

The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson demanded a poll which was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 30. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 2. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 31. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 3. Mr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 32. Sriman Biswanatha Das Mahasayo. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 33. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. |
| 5. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 34. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 35. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| 7. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 36. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 37. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 38. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 10. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 39. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 11. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 40. Mr. M. Suryanarayana. |
| 12. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 41. Mr. S. Arpudawami Udayar. |
| 13. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 42. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 14. Mr. J. Kupposwami. | 43. Rao Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| 15. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 44. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 16. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 45. Mr. M. Ratnaswami. |
| 17. Mr. M. Narayanawami Reddi. | 46. The Zamindar of Mandasa. |
| 18. Mr. V. P. Pakirswami Pillai. | 47. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampar. |
| 19. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 48. Mr. V. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar. |
| 20. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 49. Mr. K. K. Koya Sahib. |
| 21. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | 50. Mr. Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib. |
| 22. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 51. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 23. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | 52. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib. |
| 24. Mr. N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai. | 53. Khan Sahib Saiyid Diwan Abdur Razzaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 25. Mr. A. Subbarayudu. | 54. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 26. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | |
| 27. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Gounder. | |
| 28. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | |
| 29. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 7. Mr. T. E. Moir. |
| 2. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 8. Mr. F. J. Richards. |
| 3. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul lah Sahib Bahadur. | 9. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. |
| 4. The hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 10. Mr. R. Littlehailes. |
| 5. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 11. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. |
| 6. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 12. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| | 13. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |

The motion was carried, 54 voting for and 13 against.

Motions 70 to 76-A.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—

70. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 9,000.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—

71. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 9,000.

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI:—

72. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,000 for travelling allowances to professional survey parties by Rs. 45,000.

17th March 1922]

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—

73. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 9,000.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—

74. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 9,000.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—

75. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 9,000.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

76. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 10,000.*

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—

76-A. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for charge allowance.*

Motion 77.

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"The motion that stands in my name runs as follows:—

77. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 3,000.*

"I believe, Sir, that, after the strongly expressed opinion of the Council the hon. the Revenue Member will not oppose this motion. I, therefore, beg to formally move this motion."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Of course, I must object to any reduction under this head, and I do not think I need waste the time of the House with many arguments. I appeal to the House to consider that I have as far as possible scrutinized these figures myself. They were put before me for a larger amount than are entered here, and if the House were to expect any further reduction, I do not think I could carry out this reduction with anything like a responsibility for efficiency of administration."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Might I point out, Sir, that in this case the allotment is already more than 25 per cent less than the revised estimate, and that the only result of cutting down this amount below that which is necessary will be that officers will be useless, because they will have to sit at headquarters as the Council will not pay for them for travelling, so that this will really mean sheer waste of money. If the Council wish to undertake the responsibility for that, the Government must accept the motion as it is, but do let the Council understand that the work will not be done because touring officers must sit at their headquarters if there is no money to pay for their travelling allowances. In other words this is going to be an expensive proposal, not a proposal for economy at all."

[17th March 1922]

3-15 p.m.

On the motion of the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter, a poll was taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 27. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. |
| 2. Dr. Appalanarasayya Nayudu. | 28. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 3. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 29. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 4. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 30. Sriman Biswanatha Das Mahasayo. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. | 31. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 32. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 7. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 33. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 34. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 35. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 10. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 36. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 11. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 37. Mr. M. R. Seturathnam Ayyar. |
| 12. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 38. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 13. Mr. J. Kuppuswami. | 39. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 14. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 40. Mr. M. Ratnaswami. |
| 15. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 41. The Zamindar of Mandasa. |
| 16. Mr. V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 42. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 17. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 43. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 18. Rao Sahib A. Ramayya Punja. | 44. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib. |
| 19. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | 45. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 46. Mr. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib. |
| 21. Mr. N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai. | 47. Khan Sahib Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 22. Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 48. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 23. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | |
| 24. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | |
| 25. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao. | |
| 26. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 7. Mr. T. E. Moir. |
| 2. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 8. Mr. F. J. Richards. |
| 3. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habit-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 9. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. |
| 4. The hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 10. Mr. R. Littlehales. |
| 5. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 11. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. |
| 6. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 12. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| | 13. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| | 14. Mr. R. T. Kesayulu Pillai. |

The motion was carried, 48 voting for and 14 against it.

Motions 78 to 85.

The following motions were not made :—

MR. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

78. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 3,000.

MR. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

79. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 3,000.

MR. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

80. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 3,000.

MR. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

81. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 5,335.

17th March 1922]

Dr P. SUBBARAYAN :—

82. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 3,000.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

83. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 4,000.*

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

84. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,72,200 for professional survey parties by Rs. 4,50,000.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

85. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,000 for travelling allowance under special cadastral surveys of municipal towns and unions by Rs. 3,500.*

Motion 86.

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—“Sir, I beg to move the following motion which stands in my name :—

86. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 9,600 for one special settlement officer.*

“Hon. Members will find from the budget estimates presented to us that there is one special settlement officer and 18 special assistant settlement officers, some for 6 months, others for 11 months and one for 4 months. Last year we had only 13 in all, and in view of the fact that there is no special reason forthcoming for this increase, I suggest that one special settlement officer should go. He is said to be paid Rs. 800 a month and therefore I propose that Rs. 9,600 (salary for one year) be omitted.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“Probably I may inform the hon. Member, Sir, that we have at the present moment a number of settlement parties working and the total number of settlement officers has been fixed with reference to the large amount of settlement work that is to be carried on in Bellary, Anantapur, Tanjore and Trichinopoly districts. If there is to be any reduction in the number of settlement officers, the outturn of work—that will be the immediate result—will necessarily be small and as an inevitable consequence we shall have to spread the whole work over a larger number of years than it will be possible for the full complement of officers to do. That I assume may be regarded as bad finance. If the House is interested to know how these various officers are employed or are proposed to be employed during the next year, I can give them that information. The first party, Sir, is working in Tanjore. We have made provision for three officers for twelve months and four officers for six months only and one other officer for 11 months. The whole district of Tanjore is due for resettlement in the year 1923–24. So the work preliminary to the introduction of resettlement is going on; the scheme report is under the consideration of Government and orders are expected to issue soon. The second party is employed in South Arcot and North Arcot. For this we provide three officers for 12 months and one for 4 months. Resettlement is due in 1922–23 in the Vriddhachalam taluk of the South Arcot district. So far as Chidambaram is concerned resettlement already became due and the work that is being done is the winding up and classification of assessed waste lands. In Bellary and

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [17th March 1922]

Anantapur we intend to retain two officers for the whole year. In the Anantapur district, Gooty and Tadpatri taluks became due in 1921-22. Adoni and Siruguppa became due in 1920-21, but we postponed resettlement operations therein on account of seasonal conditions of those taluks, to be taken up in 1922-23. Harpanahalli is due in 1923-24, and work will be taken up next year. The fourth party is employed in Trichinopoly, for which we want two officers for 6 months and one for 4 months, but the district is due for resettlement in 1924-25 and so the work that is now being done is the revision of adangals and other preliminary work. In Ganjam and Vizagapatam, only one officer is employed, as all the work is nearing completion and no additional officer is needed there. From this statement it will be evident that we have not taken a single officer for more period than is absolutely necessary. As a result of the speeding up of these operations we expect to realize an additional revenue of Rs. 2,84,000 in the next year. If there is anything like an interference with the quantity of work that has to be done by these officers during the next year, the House will have to be prepared for a proportionate reduction in the shape of revenue."

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—" Sir, I am not satisfied with the arguments advanced by the hon. the Revenue Member, but in view of the fact that we have larger reductions proposed later on, and in order to save time, I beg to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 87 to 95.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

87. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 46,560 for special settlement officers by Rs. 80,000. (Abolition of two out of eleven posts.)*

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

88. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 46,560 for special assistant settlement officers by Rs. 8,460.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

89. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,200 for special settlement officers.*

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

90. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4.13 lakhs for temporary establishments.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

91. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,13,000 for temporary establishment by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

92. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,13,000 for settlement parties by Rs. 100.*

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

93. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,13,000 for temporary establishment, settlement parties, by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

94. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,78,834 for establishments including temporary by Rs. 1,00,000.*

17th March 1922]

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

95. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 50,000.*

Motion 96.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—“ Sir, the motion standing in my name runs thus :—

96. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 10,300.*

“ This is another motion to reduce the allotment under travelling allowance by 10 per cent which comes in this case to Rs. 10,300. I beg formally to move this proposition and leave it in the hands of the House.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
“ I think, Sir, I have simply to urge the same argument, but, however, I wish to state one more fact for the information of the House, and it is this. In the course of my scrutiny of the estimates received from heads of departments on account of travelling allowances, I cut down those estimates to the extent of 10 lakhs. If that will not satisfy the House as an indication of my sincere co-operation in reducing expenditure, I do not know what else will.”

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—“ I find that the budget estimate for this item for 1921-22 was Rs. 75,925, and the revised estimate something less. I therefore press my motion.”

The motion was put and carried. The reduction was made.

Motions 97 to 105.

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

97. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 20,000.*

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

98. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 10,300.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

99. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 50,000.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

100. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,000 for travelling allowances to special settlement and assistant settlement officers by Rs. 51,500.*

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

101. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 29,175.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

102. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 10,300.*

[17th March 1922]

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

103. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 10,300.*

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

104. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,03,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 10,000.*

MR. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

105. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 19,400 for duty allowances to special settlement and assistant settlement officers.*

Motion 106.

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo then made the following motion :—

106. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 19,400 for duty allowances.*

In doing so, he said :—“ This is a question of duty allowances which are on the same footing as the travelling allowances. We are against any duty allowances being given to any one for doing his duty. These duty allowances may be given in special cases, but the Government have to satisfy us that in special cases some special work of a special kind is being done. Till that is done, we shall urge propositions of this kind.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—

3-30 p.m. “ Sir, this question of duty allowance in the case of the special settlement officers came up—shall I say—for heated discussion at the time of the last budget debate; and it was then my duty with the little experience that I then possessed of the work of these officers, to oppose it as strongly as I could. The House was then fully convinced of the reasons I advanced and withdrew the motion for the reduction. Now, with the extra twelve months’ experience that I have had of the nature of the work done by the Special Settlement officers, I not merely endorse all that I said on the previous occasion but I would endorse it much more forcibly. The duties of the Special and Assistant Settlement officers are so arduous, so unpleasant and so different from the nature of the duties which a Revenue Divisional officer is called upon to discharge that to expect a Deputy Collector to bear this unpleasant burden on the same pay without anything like a compensation for the extra trouble, hardship and inconvenience, will be practically precluding the possibilities of any Deputy Collector accepting the work of the Special or Assistant Settlement Officer, which requires great courage and industry. The nature of the investigation he has to conduct within a given time going from place to place and village to village, and even within infected areas is of course not the ordinary lot of a Revenue Divisional Officer. I merely draw the attention of the House to the speeches then delivered and I shall therefore not repeat the arguments advanced both by myself and the others that spoke in favour of my views. One significant fact that I would point out is that the House knows sufficiently well that similar officers in the non-votable departments are drawing this duty allowance and I would ask whether it is the intention of the House to draw an invidious distinction. And simply because these Indian officers are at your mercy, is it your intention that you should deprive them of their allowances? I fervently appeal to you on behalf of these officers who are in your hands.”

17th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I support this motion before the House. The hon. the Revenue Member referred to the motion for the reduction of duty allowances at the time of the last budget discussion. I was one of those who pleaded for the abolition of these duty allowances and I still remember vividly the arguments which were advanced in that case by my hon. Friend on the other side. My friend referred to his additional experience he has gathered during the past year, with reference to the arduous nature of the work that is done by the Settlement officers. But I appeal to the experience of the Council during the past year.

" One argument advanced by him requires an answer from me. He with very good reason, pointed out to the case of the Indian Civil Service Officers whose duty allowance cannot be touched because they are non-votable. He also asked us, with good reason whether this Council is going to deprive one class of officers alone, of their duty allowance because their duty allowance could be voted for or against by this Council. I would, however, urge that if this Council votes for the abolition of the duty allowances of these officers, the Government will in reason be bound to abolish these allowances in the case of Indian Civil Service officers also."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" I wish to give my strong support to this motion moved by my hon. Friend Mr. Rath. The arguments advanced by my friend the hon. the Revenue Member have not appealed to me. I do think that it is not possible for us with these financial conditions to pay much consideration to these allowances. As regards the other point raised by my friend the Revenue Member, I would only ask him to remember that we are in a diarchy and it is no argument to say that because the treatment results in an invidious distinction being made, therefore there should be no treatment at all even if it is otherwise just and proper. I join with my hon. Friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar in thinking that if the resolution is carried the higher officers that are now beyond the reach of this House will in a spirit of generosity and equity, relinquish their allowances also. All this is due to the original sin of diarchy which we must face as best as possible. With these few words, Sir, I support the motion strongly."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" Sir, the constitutional question which has been raised is hardly one with which I am here concerned. But I would say this—I think they would agree with me though I am not speaking on behalf of all the Members of my service and the other Imperial services—that at the time when the question of these reforms was under consideration, in view of the changes that were to be introduced, the question as to our position under the reforms caused us great anxiety and we decided that it was necessary to press for certain safeguards. These reforms have been in existence hardly for a little over a year and it is matter for great regret to us to find that our apprehensions were more than justified or are likely to be justified by the action of this Council and that not one of the safeguards for which we ventured to ask should prove unnecessary. But the fact that I or other members of my service are and would be safe under similar circumstances surely does not justify one who has been a settlement officer himself in saying this is no concern of mine and in refraining from saying a word on behalf of those Indian officers whom this motion if carried will affect.

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[17th March 1922]

"I myself worked as a settlement officer for nine years and with Indian officers some of whom are still serving loyally and faithfully in that department I can only say that one never could have wished to work with better officers. I venture to plead their cause before this Council and to ask for that generous consideration which they indeed merit in view of the very arduous nature of their task. The hon. Member Mr. Krishnan Nayar summarily brushed aside an appeal that was made as regards the conditions they have to work under. I have personal knowledge drawn from my nine years' tenure as a Special Settlement officer of what these conditions are and that it is by no means attractive or easy work. It involves touring, more prolonged and continuous touring, perhaps than in any other department and the entire negation of domestic life which that implies. My own experience was for about ten months in the year I had to be out in camp. This I have no doubt is still the case with these Indian officers. I do not wish to talk too much about myself: but can only refer to one's own experiences and personal knowledge and on one occasion I remember being in camp in Cuddapah district through the whole of the hot weather without cessation and the hon. Member Mr. Narasimhacharlu can tell you what that means.

"These Indian officers for whom I plead have to face the same conditions. It is not merely the inspections in the field that is his lot. After the field work is over and you return tired out after midday you have time only for a hurried meal and have to sit for hours to write up the results of your inspection and to deal with a large number of files. Then there is the responsibility of supervising large subordinate staffs mostly temporary establishments which, as I think, the House will realize require special supervision and management.

"I quite sympathise with the desire of the House for economy. But, I would ask: is it really proposed to accept this motion and yet to expect this arduous work with all the strain it involves as I have attempted to indicate within the brief space of time at my disposal, to be undertaken cheerfully by officers who feel that this House refuses it any recognition and rejects their reasonable claim for some, little measure of extra remuneration. I would appeal to the House to consider before taking such a step."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"After the eloquent appeal from a settlement officer of the practical experience of Mr. Moir very little on my part should be needed to induce this House to reject this motion. The little I have to add is to draw attention once again to the debate last year which concluded with a speech of mine quoting facts within my personal knowledge of the conditions of life under which the Settlement Officers in the Tinnevely district had to work in 1909 and 1910. The particular officers whom I mentioned then were Mr. Gwynn and Mr. Chadwick and if either of them were here, they could give ample corroboration to Mr. Moir's experience. On the occasion of that debate the final vote was 46 against the reduction and 31 in favour of it. The House then vindicated its reputation for the commonsense and fairness that it can bring to bear upon the consideration of the subjects before it.

"I should next like to say this with reference to the appeal that has been made from, I think, two quarters regarding the allowances in the case of Special Settlement Officers and Assistant Settlement Officers of the Indian Civil Service. The appeal which has been made to us as a Government is

17th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

to undertake to remove these allowances also and an appeal is at the same time made to the honour of the Indian Civil Service officers who draw them not to receive allowances which their Indian fellow workers are debarred from receiving. I should like to say emphatically that the Government cannot undertake to do any such injustice to the former class of officers, merely because this House deals inequitably with the latter class. It is a matter on which I feel warmly. I do not wish to accentuate warmth of feeling elsewhere, least of all within the last fortnight of my tenure of office, but I do feel that this House ought to think and think seriously about this question of reduction. I pledge my word for it that both classes of officers have earned this allowance so thoroughly that to deprive them of it would be a cruel injustice."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I say one word in explanation of the general question of duty allowance? As I explained yesterday, there are many circumstances under which these allowances are given, one of which is the case where, in order to gain greater elasticity in appointment, there is exchanged for an appointment on special pay an addition to a regular grade with an allowance attached to make up the difference. This gives discretion to the appointing authority to choose suitable officers from the general grade from time to time, and if they become unfit for the work for physical or other reasons, to send them back and take others. In the present instance, the Deputy Commissioner of Settlement years ago used to draw a special pay rising up to Rs. 1,100. There has been exchanged for that the lower pay of a Deputy Collector with an allowance so that suitable Deputy Collectors can be taken on Settlement work from time to time and no man is kept at it all his life. The Council will see that as a result of this arrangement there is likely to be no increase, but rather a saving of expenditure."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I wish only to add a few words. We heard three members of the Indian Civil Service speak on this matter. It is not our intention to cause any unnecessary hardship to any officers of the Settlement Department who are already hard worked. I do not think that any of the gentlemen who have spoken here to-day on this subject will charge any member of this Council with any desire to inflict injustice on any class of officers whether they are in the Settlement Department or otherwise. The question that has been raised by this issue shows our difficulty that has been felt ever since these Reforms came into force. Under this scheme of votable and non-votable items, so far as the duty allowance of these officers who are placed on the non-votable list is concerned, we have absolutely no power to deal with this question generally from the point of view of the services as a whole whether European or Indian. I contended last time that this placing of the duty allowance on the non-votable list was unjustified under section 72-D of the Government of India Act which says that the 'salaries and pensions of persons appointed by or with the approval of His Majesty or by the Secretary of State in Council'—."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I rise to a point of order. The placing of items on the votable or the non-votable list is a matter for His Excellency the Governor and I think we are not entitled to discuss it in this connexion."

[17th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I am perfectly aware of that fact. My hon. Friend need not charge me with not knowing that elementary proposition. The point is this. Many members of this Council feel that on account of this diarchy the system which places one set of salaries and allowances under the control of this Council and another set outside their control is a very inconvenient system of dealing with these questions, and on account of the risk of being thought unjustifiable by certain officers, many hon. Members really wanted to force this matter to a decision. Let there be no impression on the part of any of the officers employed by Government that we want to inflict any hardship on any deserving class of officers. On the merits of the question it is unnecessary to go into the matter at all. The question is whether this Council should have the power of dealing with the allowances as a whole."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Does that question arise, Sir, on this vote?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Certainly. The proposal is to omit the allotment of Rs. 19,400 for duty allowance. I believe the item is the duty allowance of officers other than those of the Indian Civil Service. It is open to any hon. Member who wants this duty allowance to go to say that duty allowances are wrong whether given to the officers of the Indian Civil Service or to the officers of the Provincial Service, and that, though the House cannot do anything against the first set of allowances, there is nothing to prevent it from dealing with the second set.

"I would however appeal to the hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao that if in addition to the motions which we have got on the agenda we are going to deal with the general merits of diarchy, we shall require a much larger period than nine days. Once again I urge hon. Members to put due restraint upon their anxiety to explain matters to one another and to the Government. I will now put this motion to the vote."

The motion was put and carried.

The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter demanded a poll which was taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 22. Dr. P. Subbarayan. |
| 2. Dr. M. Appalannarasayya Nayudu. | 23. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayakar. |
| 3. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiayar. | 24. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. | 25. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 26. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. |
| 6. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiayar. | 27. " M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 7. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 28. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 29. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahesayo. |
| 9. " T. A. Ramalinga Chettiayar. | 30. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. |
| 10. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 31. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 11. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiayar. | 32. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 12. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 33. Sriman Sasibhushana Rath Mahesayo. |
| 13. Mr. J. Kuppuswami. | 34. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 14. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 35. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 15. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiayar. | 36. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 16. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 37. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 17. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 38. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 18. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | 39. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib Bahadur. |
| 19. Mr. W. P. A. Soundara Pandiya Nadar. | 40. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddiyar. | 41. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib |
| 21. Mr. N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai. | |

17th March 1922]

Noes.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. |
| 2. " Sir Charles Todhunter. | 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad | 11. Mr. R. Littlehales. |
| Habib-ul-lah Sabib Bahadur. | 12. Mr. E. Periyanyakam. |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 13. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| 5. " Mr. P. Ramarayaniogar. | 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 6. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi | 15. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. |
| Nayudu. | 16. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 7. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 17. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 18. The Zamindar of Mandasa. |

The motion was carried, 41 voting *for* and 18 *against* it.

Motion 107.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" I move—

107. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 21,800 for other contingencies by Rs. 15,000.*

"In so doing, I wish to know why when only Rs. 3,837 was spent in 1920-21 and according to the revised estimate for the current year Rs. 4,400 only is provided for there should be Rs. 21,800 provided for in the budget estimate for 1922-23. While we have been spending about Rs. 4,000 and odd, why should there be such a large amount budgeted for this year?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" In the year to which reference has been pointedly made, namely, 1920-21, the rate at which allowances were paid to karnams for the preparation of the village accounts in respect of resettlement duties was 2 annas per day. Subsequently it was found that that allowance was so paltry that it should be at least doubled up. The recommendation of the Board of Revenue was accepted in the course of last year and an allotment of Rs. 20,500 was definitely asked for : owing to the suspension of most of the settlement operations in the course of last year the amount actually spent was Rs. 4,400. As I have already said, these operations are expected to be renewed in the course of next year when we are to pay at the rate of 4 annas in lieu of 2 annas which was the rate in 1920-21. We have also quite recently offered a reward of Rs. 10 to every karnam who finishes his accounts correctly within the shortest period so that we may be saving the daily payment of 4 annas. The payment of Rs. 10 for expediting the work satisfactorily has also been taken into account in the amount of Rs. 21,800 budgeted for. Before accepting the allotment of Rs. 25,800, I asked the Board of Revenue whether they could not reduce it to Rs. 15,000. They gave me all the details of the work and the actual expenditure that will have to be incurred, and with these details I was perfectly satisfied and entered this amount. All this will go for the payment of karnams who form one of the units of the village establishment on whose behalf appeals have been repeatedly made by this House. If still the Council wants to reduce the item, it will only effect those karnams."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" I am quite satisfied, Sir, and I shall withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[17th March 1922]

Motions 108 and 109.

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

108. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,92,800 for settlement parties by Rs. 4,50,000.*

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

109. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,92,800 for settlement parties by Rs. 100.*

Motion 110.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ Sir, I beg to move :—

110. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,92,800 for settlement parties by Rs. 2,00,000.*

“ In the year 1920, the settlement parties cost Rs. 4,78,075 and in the year 1920–21 the budget estimate was Rs. 5,65,400 and the revised estimate was Rs. 6·10 lakhs; in the year 1921–22 the budget estimate was Rs. 7·12 lakhs and the revised estimate shows only Rs. 6·35 lakhs. In this year it is sought to raise the amount of expenditure on this item to Rs. 8,92,800, that is very nearly double the expenditure incurred in 1920. The policy of these settlement parties and the work in which they are engaged are quite unpopular and the opinion of the Council generally on these settlement parties and their anxiety for the reduction in the expenditure incurred on them are very well known and I do not want to go into them. But I may draw the attention of the Council to the provisions that are made in the present budget. The number of settlement officers is proposed to be raised by five and the other establishment is the same, whereas under the head of temporary establishment Rs. 2,50,000 appears under the revised estimate for 1921–22 and Rs. 4,13,000 is put down as the budget estimate for 1922–23. It appears to me, Sir, that the object of the Government in having provided large sums under such items as this as lump allotments is probably for utilization for other purposes by reappropriation. The Government probably want to provide for any emergencies that may arise and so they want to bring these as lump grants with a view to provide for any other proposals they may bring forward later.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ May I say, Sir, that it is not a lump sum to be utilized for any emergencies during the course of the year. It is a provision for staff which is continued from year to year though it is called temporary. We can give the hon. Member the details if he wishes to have them.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ It is of course temporary establishment, Sir, and we know what the establishment is and what it will cost. That is why I drew attention to the difference between the revised estimate and the budget provision asked for. It is because the establishment is temporary that difficulties arise. We find that there is a very large increase in the temporary establishment in the current year over the figures in the revised estimate amounting to 2 lakhs and 50 thousands. As the provision that is made for the next year is such a large amount we find it difficult to see how this very large increase may be necessary. That is why I say the inference is possible that if a lump

4 p.m.

17th March 1922] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

increase is made, the Government perhaps intend to utilize it in other directions. Moreover no definite reason is alleged for the abnormal increase under this head. Sir, the Council as a whole has been against lump sum provisions. Even last year it was on the distinct understanding that the lump sum provisions would be scrutinized by the Finance Committee that they were passed. This year we only repeat what was said last year and it seems to me, Sir, that it is not the proper way to put down such lump allotments especially in a case like this where the figures have been increased to a very large extent. I think there is no justification whatever for the increase. Since the figures were in relation to the temporary establishment we could not scrutinize them so much as we would have done if they related to a permanent staff. It was said, Sir, that this is not the time to settle big questions of policy on what was termed as catch-votes."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"I have not called it a catch-vote, Sir."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, I said so and I do regard it is right, Sir, in circumstances like this."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"I only want to be understood as not trying in any way to settle big questions of policy by catch-votes. I only move for the reduction so that opportunity might be given for the Government to see whether reduction is possible and to carry it out if it is. With these words, I beg to move for the reduction."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"It seems to me, therefore, evident, Sir, to the mind of the hon. Mover of this motion that the whole increase in the total allotment entered in the next year's budget is attributed mainly to the large provision made in the temporary establishment. If, therefore, I can explain to his satisfaction and to the satisfaction of the House, as to why that increased allotment is made under temporary establishment, I hope the hon. Member will feel convinced about the necessity for the same. The House is probably aware, for, I have stated it so often, that we have got now five permanent parties besides a number of temporary parties. We have got on the whole a permanent establishment which is sufficient only to cover the activities of no more than two and a half parties. All the other parties which are in operation have therefore to take on temporary establishments from time to time. The nature, extent, and size of the temporary establishments are largely moulded by the volume of work that has got to be done. The hon. Member who moved this motion complained that if the allotment had been put under the head permanent, it would have given him an opportunity to examine it more carefully. If it is the intention of the House that in future I should convert the whole of the temporary establishment into permanent so as to give the House an opportunity of scrutinizing the details, I shall do so only with pleasure. The total expenditure that is incurred at the present moment on account of the permanent establishments in the Settlement department is no more than one and odd lakhs. That, Sir, is the total permanent establishment employed under all the parties. That, as I said, is sufficient only to carry on the activities of no more than two and a half parties. As regards the rest we merely take them on temporarily. The reason why this large amount of establishment is needed for the year 1922-23 is again explicable by the oft-repeated statement that I have made in

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [17th March 1922]

this House since this morning that our activities in the matter of re-settlements are increasing and increasing definitely from 1922-23. And we have, as a *quid pro quo* for such activities, taken credit for an additional revenue of 2·94 lakhs. It was argued that this amount of Rs. 4,13,000 which we have entered in the budget is more or less an imaginary figure and that there are no details whatsoever available and that the House is merely asked to vote without any definite knowledge. As the hon. the Finance Member said, if the House is anxious to have all these details incorporated in the budget the Government have not the least objection to do so. Here are the details. The necessity of the amount of Rs. 4,13,000 is to be found in the fact that in the first party we have employed a temporary establishment costing Rs. 95,910 altogether, in the second party which is working in South Arcot and North Arcot, we have employed a temporary establishment costing Rs. 1,14,303, in the third party which is working in the Bellary and Anantapur districts the temporary establishment employed comes up to Rs. 1,13,230 and in the fourth party working in Trichinopoly to Rs. 66,753, while in the fifth party working in the Vizagapatam district we want no more than Rs. 2,804. As regards The Nilgris and Malabar where there is a special party working we have made provision for five months only as we expect the work will not last for more than that period and we have made provision for Rs. 20,000. Thus the total comes to Rs. 4,13,000. It cannot be said from the nature of the figures that I have read that they are mere random figures as it must appear evident that we have scrutinized them carefully and that we have entered the actual, the bare actual that is needed for our purpose. In the light of this information, I will ask the hon. Member to say whether we have entered merely random figures and whether they are more than what is actually wanted and whether we can hope that a saving might accrue therefrom which may be utilized for other purposes. If the hon. Member is prepared to convince me that all the temporary establishments must go, I should reply that along with them three and a half parties shall also have to go. If that really is the intention of the House, they are at perfect liberty to vote for the motion accordingly."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, it is true as stated by the hon. the Revenue Member that in the Settlement department it is not quite possible to fix the establishment on a permanent scale. Hon. Members are aware that the settlement operations in any one year are not the same in the year succeeding. Several taluks come in for settlement in a particular year and the operations are not exactly the same from year to year. Much depends upon the nature of the original settlement. Therefore it is absolutely essential that there should be variations and that the scale of establishment should also vary. Sometimes you have to expand the establishment and at others contract it. Therefore, generally speaking, it is certainly somewhat inconvenient to have a permanent establishment on a permanent scale in the operations of the Settlement department. That is a fact which will be recognized by others. I think my hon. Friend will realize this difficulty of fixing the department on a permanent basis. I can assure the hon. the Revenue Member that nobody has any desire to dislocate the work of the department and that there is absolutely no need for any misunderstanding of the object with which this motion has been placed."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I was very much struck at the increase in the figures which have really grown double of what

17th March 1922] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar.]

they were in 1920. That is a matter which should attract the attention of the House and of the Government. Now, Sir, I do not propose to press my motion, but my object in bringing it is that the expression of opinion of this Council on this question will carry weight with the Government who will then look into the matter with a view to effecting all possible savings. I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

(The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter rose to speak.)

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Mover having asked for leave to withdraw the motion, the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter will be entitled to speak on the withdrawal, point out for example the reasons why leave should not be given, and why the vote of the House should be taken on the motion."

Leave was granted and the motion was withdrawn.

Motions 111 to 118.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—

111. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,62,800 for revenue settlement by Rs. 2,00,000.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—

112. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,62,800 by Rs. 2,00,000.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—

113. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,62,800 by Rs. 2,00,000.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—

114. *To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 10,62,800 for revenue settlement by Rs. 2,00,000.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—

115. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,62,800 for revenue settlement by Rs. 2,00,000.*

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—

116. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 21,03,772 for survey and settlement by Rs. 11,02,800.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

117. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 21,03,772 for survey by Rs. 1,00,000."*

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—

118. *To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 21,03,772 for survey and settlement by Rs. 100.*

Motion 119.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, I beg to move—

119. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 21,03,772 for survey and settlement by Rs. 100.*

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.] [17th March 1922]

“ In doing so, I wish to invite the attention of the Government and of the House to certain, what I consider to be, unsatisfactory features of the administration in this demand. In the Administration Report reviewing Survey, Settlement and Land Records department for 1919 to 1920, there is a statement showing the charges and recoveries on account of survey of estates, municipalities and unions and in that year I find a sum of Rs. 1,17,689 as the unrecovered balance. In the succeeding year, this amount has increased to Rs. 1,82,119. That shows that money that is due to Government is not being recovered with the promptitude that one would associate with the Government and their officers.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ May I ask the hon. Member where he is quoting the figures from ? ”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I am citing from the Administration Report reviewing the Survey, Settlement and Land Records department for 1919-20 and 1920-21.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ May I ask, Sir, what the item is referred to as the outstandings in this particular department, viz., Survey ? ”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I have a copy of the general report where the total arrears irrecoverable are given. And I think I am in order in reviewing the administration of the department as a whole.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ May I rise to a point of order ? The Government are found fault with for not recovering without our knowing what amount it is that we failed to recover in this particular item.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ The hon. Member may look at the figures at leisure. The second point I wish to draw attention to is the specially high salary at which several settlement officers are employed. If you turn to page 40 of the budget you will notice that there are Assistant Settlement officers on pay varying from Rs. 300 to Rs. 600. I think, Sir, if officers on Rs. 300 or on sums slightly above are quite able to do the work, I do not see any reason why more costly officers should be employed.

“ The third and, in my opinion, the most important point which I wish to urge is about the revenue registration. It may perhaps be a question, Sir, what connexion there is between revenue registration and survey and settlement. The survey committee of 1914 have answered that question for us. They said that they could not see any theoretical or practical reason for distinguishing between a survey and the other operations which culminated in the registration of title. Now, we shall consider how far this registration of title is satisfactorily done by the Government under the existing system. In paragraph 58 of their report, the survey committee comment upon it in the following terms :—

4-15 p.m. “ Apart from the essential consideration that, by failing to keep registry up to date, the state is neglecting a duty imposed on it by law and equity, we have a considerable body of evidence to show that the existing state of things causes general uncertainty as to title, gives scope for oppression and favouritism on the part of village officers, leads to excessive litigation, frequently based on improperly drawn up documents or on oral evidence, true or false, and helps to explain the somewhat contemptuous attitude sometimes adopted by Civil Courts towards revenue registers, maps and proceedings. Village officers have notoriously to keep private registers of occupancy, irrespective of the revenue registers, in order to make the collection of revenue possible. The general trend of our evidence is to show that, except for a short interval

17th March 1922] [Mr. A. Rangavatha Mudaliyar.]

after each settlement, about 50 per cent of the names entered in the revenue register do not correspond with the facts, the registered pattadar *not* being the proprietor, nor in many cases the person in independent possession of the land ;

"I would like the hon. the Revenue Member to pause and consider over this fact that within a very short interval after the close of settlement operations, the whole thing seems to get back again into the original chaotic condition. And then they proceed :—

'the entries sometimes stand in the name of deceased persons. This is clearly anomalous and demoralizing ; it is also prejudicial to discipline : for the karnam, having a private monopoly of the knowledge required for the purpose of collecting revenue, has his immediate superiors to some extent in his power, as his suspension or dismissal might make the prompt collection of revenue very difficult. Another result of the inaccuracy of the registers is that, at present, Revenue authorities have frequently to seek the aid of the Registration Department, in order to obtain information in connexion with loans and cases of co-operative credit, etc.'

"As a remedy for these things, they suggest the adoption of certain measures in their report, e.g., in paragraph 115 of their report, but I fail to see why, so far, the Government have not been able to act up to the recommendations made. On the other hand, all their proposals seem to be still under consideration. In G.O. No. 2657, dated 3rd December 1921, at the end they say :—

'The question of the creation of a system of record of rights has been engaging the attention of Government for many years.'

"Still they are engaged in considering the question. That was why, Sir, on the previous occasion I hesitated to accept a mere statement on the part of the Government that the thing will receive their consideration. Here is a thing which has been engaging their consideration for a series of years and still we are now no further than where we were before. The Government order referred to by me states that

'During the year the experimental scheme suggested by the Inspector-General of Registration for the maintenance of a partial record of rights by the Registration department was carried on.'

"I do not know when the scheme was recommended and why the scheme recommended by the survey committee was not at all taken on hand.

"With a view to draw the attention of the House and the Government to these facts, Sir, I have tabled for a reduction of Rs. 100."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
"Sir, if there is any occasion when I should take advantage of opportunity to expedite work by raising the plea of want of notice, I think it is this. For, I do not think I can venture within the short time at my disposal to enter into the pros and cons of the various issues which the hon. Member has raised, quoting as he did from various official documents. That would take me a few hours to explain. Therefore, Sir, I shall not attempt to make any explanation on that matter. If the hon. Member brought himself on the agenda merely with a view to an expression of his opinion, I think that object has now been accomplished."

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I want also, Sir, to elicit the opinion of the Government as to the policy they want to pursue hereafter."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Order, order. I presume that the hon. Member has not previously acquainted the Government that on this motion these are the points which he will raise. He has presumably not done so ; and of course he is not bound to do it. That being so, I must also say, in

[The President.]

[17th March 1922]

fairness to the Government Member called on to explain, that, if an hon. Member raises a number of points upon an administration report in the course of a motion for a reduction of grant, though he is technically in order, the hon. Member of Government cannot be accused of any discourtesy if he says that these things have come up to him only just now, that he has no time to look into them, nor will he be in a position to deal with them satisfactorily within the short time at his disposal. It is a matter entirely within his discretion to say that and I believe that is what he says now."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Yes, Sir."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I never made a demand of that sort, Sir. I am glad, however, that the hon. the Revenue Member has acquitted me of a desire to advertise myself here. As such an intention has been disclaimed by the hon. the Revenue Member, I have no objection to withdraw my motion and, accordingly, do so."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 120 to 143.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

120. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,68,150 for revenue inspectors by Rs. 25,000.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—

121. *To reduce Rs. 7,68,150, cost of 1,069 inspectors, by cost of 125 revenue inspectors.*

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—

122. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,68,150 for revenue inspectors by Rs. 52,500.*

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo:—

123. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,68,150 for revenue inspectors by Rs. 42,000.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

124. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 36,600 for leave allowance by Rs. 25,000.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—

125. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,90,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 30,000.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI:—

126. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,90,000 for travelling allowances to executive subordinates by Rs. 95,000.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

127. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,22,280 for duty allowance.*

17th March 1922]

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

*128. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,22,280 for duty allowance.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

129. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,22,380 for duty allowance for executive subordinates.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

130. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,000 for anticipated increase owing to revision of establishments.*

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—

131. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 42,24,800 for preparing revenue and agricultural statistics by Rs. 2,61,390.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

132. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 72,000 for establishment for survey, record-of-rights, etc., of estate lands.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

133. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for temporary establishment.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

134. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 9,000 for travelling allowance to the executive subordinates for maintenance of land records by Rs. 4,500.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

135. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,235 for travelling allowance to executive subordinates for maintenance of survey of municipal towns and unions by Rs. 613.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

136. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,700 for maintenance of survey of municipal towns and unions by Rs. 100.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

137. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 43.09 lakhs for land records by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

138. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 43,09,000 for land records by Rs. 100.*

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD SADULLA BADSHA SAHIB :—

139. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 11,41,588 for the provision of munsifs by Rs. 100.*

140. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 52,772 for monigars by Rs. 100.*

[17th March 1922]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

141. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 38,78,264 for allowance to district and village officers—ryotwari village officers—by Rs. 100.*

142. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,97,056 for proprietary estates village service by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDN :—

143. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 48,08,011 for allowances to district and village officers by Rs. 6,30,228.*

Motion 144.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“I beg to move, Sir, the following motion standing in my name :—

144. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 48,08,011 for allowances to district and village officers by Rs. 100.*

“With reference to what you were pleased to state a few minutes ago regarding the desirability of giving previous intimation to the Member in charge, of the object with which such motions are brought, I may, with the permission of my hon. Friend, at once say that I spoke to him the day before yesterday evening privately as to what my object in bringing this motion was. My object in bringing this motion is simply to bring to the notice of Government and also the hon. Member in charge the policy that should be pursued with reference to these village officers, namely that their pay should be increased. My hon. Friend, the Revenue Member, after I gave notice of this motion, has spoken more than once when dealing with the Court Fees Bill and the Stamp duties, about his sympathy with these village headmen and the desirability of increasing their pay. No doubt, the Council rejected the two Bills which were introduced by the hon. the Revenue Member with the specific object of finding funds for increasing the pay of village officers, but the Council did so for very good reasons. On various occasions various members of this Council have been impressing upon my hon. Friend the need for raising the pay of these village officers, especially after the pay of the village Karnams and menials has been increased. My hon. Friend has in a way stated that he is prepared to increase the pay of these officers. My object in bringing and moving this motion is to raise a debate on this question and to elicit a pointed reply from my hon. Friend on this specific question of increasing the pay of these village officers. With these words, I move it.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“I gladly welcome this opportunity, Sir, of trying to allay, if I can, any misgivings that might be lurking in the minds of the village officials as regards their future. I may at once inform the House that it was only the day before yesterday in the lunch interval that I received a deputation from the Presidency Village Officers' Association in regard to this same matter, and the reply which I gave to that deputation has, I think, already appeared in the newspapers which is fairly expressive of my opinion. I will again repeat, however, that it is the intention of the Government to take into consideration the claims of these people, and, as I have already told the House on the

17th March 1922] [Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

last occasion, I intend to come up before the House with a supplementary demand after all these demands have been voted upon and ask the sanction of the House to incur that expenditure which will result in increasing the deficit and our going up to the Government of India to lend us that amount also. That information, I think, I gave the House on the last occasion as well. I am not now in a position to discuss the details in regard to the actual increases that are proposed in respect of each class of officials. They are too many and too detailed. However, when I do come up before the House with a motion, I shall be in a position to explain those details more clearly. Let me repeat, Sir, that I have always had my sympathy for the village officials, and I shall continue to show the same sympathy towards them."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Sir, after having heard my hon. Friend who is prepared even to borrow for the purpose of increasing the pay of these village officers, if the House will kindly permit me to withdraw my motion, I want to withdraw it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 145 and 146.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—

145. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 48,08,011 for allowances for district and village officers by Rs. 100.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

146. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,61,76,223 for land revenue by Rs. 5,00,000.*

Motion 147.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I do not wish to take much of the time of the Council. I think it is necessary that in considering the question of economy we should consider the question of the simplification of village accounts. I have spoken about this several times. There is no use effecting retrenchment in the departments unless we go to the very bottom and examine which portion of the village accounts are necessary and which portion should be deleted. It is only just to bring this to the notice of the Revenue Member that I gave notice of this motion. I do not think any discussion with reference to the retrenchment of the revenue establishments would be fruitful unless this very salutary reform is effected. So I move—

147. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,61,76,223 for land revenue by Rs. 100."*

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"It will comfort the hon. Member to know that for some time past the simplification of the village accounts has been engaging my attention. I have already consulted the Board of Revenue on the matter. I have got some information. I have not yet had the time on account of the stress and strain for the past three months of the Legislative Council to examine it very minutely. After this is over I hope to set myself to that work, and if

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [17th March 1922]

I succeed in bringing about any simplification in the village accounts I will be very glad to do so."

On the assurance of the hon. the Revenue Member the motion* was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 148 and 149.

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

148. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,61,76,223 for land revenue by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

149. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,61,76,223 for land revenue by Rs. 100.*

Motion 150.

Rao Sahib P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—" I move—

150. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 3,500.*

"The principle has already been exhaustively discussed and accepted by the House, and I do not want to take up any more time in discussing it. I only want to say that wherever possible reduction should be made."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
"This amount is in respect of travelling allowance to the members of the Board of Revenue who appear under that particular head. This includes provision for one member who is employed on land revenue work, and another member who is employed on income-tax work. Inasmuch as we have no definite orders yet from the Government of India in regard to the separation of the income-tax work altogether from the Board of Revenue and the entire establishment and other expenses incidental to the Income-tax Commissioner, we are not in a position to reduce it. As soon as we have definite orders from the Government of India, I assure the House that all the expenses connected therewith will disappear from our Budget. In the meantime it is not possible to accept the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 151 to 161.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

151. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 3,500.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

152. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 3,500.*

17th March 1922]

MR. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

153. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 3,500.*

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

154. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 3,500.*

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

155. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,786 for Board of Revenue, financial commissioners and establishments by Rs. 50,000.*

MR. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

156. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,876 for secretariat and head-quarter establishments by Rs. 13,000.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

157. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,786 for financial commissioners and establishments by Rs. 40,000.*

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

158. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,786 for Board of Revenue, finance commissioner and establishment by Rs. 100.*

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

159. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,786 for the Board of Revenue by Rs. 100.*

MR. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

160. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,20,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 12,000.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

161. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,20,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 12,000.*

Motion 162.

MR. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" My motion is—

162. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1.20 lakhs for travelling allowances by Rs. 12,000.*

" I move this on the ten per cent basis accepted by the House."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
" I am afraid, Sir, that this is a much more difficult case than the other one; because this relates to the travelling allowance of the general establishments employed in the district and not the survey or settlement establishments against whom we have spent all our activities. This relates to the general revenue establishment. I think the hon. Members of the House will realise that just at the present moment and for some time to come it will be necessary for every officer in the Revenue Department to be constantly on the move, to tour often, and to tour much more intensively than ever he had done, with a view to keep himself in touch with the people

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [17th March 1922]

of the district. If therefore any reduction is made in this allotment under which the lowest possible amount has been entered then it will retard travelling considerably. It will force these officers to remain only at headquarters. It is desirable that the revenue officers should go about constantly. Otherwise every individual and every villager who has transactions with them will be forced to go to the taluk cutcherry for any information or for any complaint that he may have to lodge. We expect the tahsildars to go round always and ascertain matters for themselves and try to rectify the grievances, if any; similarly also in the case of the revenue divisional officers and the other superior officers of the department. At the present moment I think it will be false economy to indulge in reducing the travelling allowances in respect of these officials which would curb their movement and affect prejudicially the interests of the department. Therefore, I cannot agree to the motion."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" This is not only a land revenue issue but an issue affecting the interests of law and order. I cannot possibly consent to give anything in the nature of an instruction that district magistrates should restrict their touring in cases where it is necessary for them to visit parts of their districts where disturbances arise or are apprehended. If any reduction in this provision is made, it will be against the considered advice of the Government as tendered both by myself and by my hon. Colleague Mr. Habib-ul-lah Sahib. I should like to emphasise what he has said, viz., if in consequence of this reduction circumstances arise which make it plain that additional funds are required, the Government must come forward with applications for supplemental grants to make up such amount as may be found necessary. I certainly cannot advise any restriction of touring which might conflict with the interests of law and order."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" I understood the hon. Revenue Member to say that tahsildars are included in this. In view of the circumstances stated by the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson I withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 163 to 177.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

163. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,20,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 12,000.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

164. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,20,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 12,000.*

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

165. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,20,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 20,000.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

166. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,20,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 12,090.*

17th March 1922]

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

167. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,20,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 12,000.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

168. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,20,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 12,000.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

169. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,20,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 20,000.*

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

170. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,20,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 20,000.*

Bao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

171. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 55,000 for discretionary grants by Collectors.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

172. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 12,09,500 by Rs. 3,00,000.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

173. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 12,09,500 for general establishment, district administration, by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

174. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 12,09,500 for district administration establishment by Rs. 3,00,000.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

175. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 12,09,500 by Rs. 3,00,000.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

176. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 12,09,500 by Rs. 3,00,000.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

177. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 12,09,500 for general establishment, district administration, by Rs. 3,00,000.*

Motion 178.

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—“ I move—

178. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,29,360 for Deputy Collectors by Rs. 1,00,000.*

“ In giving notice of this motion my desire is to know when the Government is prepared to get rid of these personal assistant deputy collectors who have no responsibility except acting as intermediaries.”

[17th March 1922]

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Baha'dur :—
 “ I think, Sir, I have more than once informed the House on previous occasions as regards the present position of the personal assistant deputy collectors. I think on the last occasion in connection with the general discussion on the budget I read an extract from the latest Government Order which had been issued on this matter. Government carefully examined the possibility of abolishing the post of personal assistants altogether. There were only eleven such appointments and of these four were abolished at once. There yet remains seven, and the districts in which they are employed are fairly important and large where the assistance of a gazetted officer at the headquarters during the absence of the collector in camp was considered essential. There is also the question of the possibility of the transfer of the treasury deputy collectors to the control of the Government of India yet under consideration. We have not therefore come to any definite conclusion regarding those seven officers pending the decision of the other question.”

On the assurance given by the hon. the Revenue Member the motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 179.

The following motion was not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

179. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 32,000 for temporary establishment under Subdivisional establishments.*

Motion 180.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—“ My motion is—

180. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3.25 lakhs for travelling expenses by Rs. 32,500.*

“ I find that in the revised estimate for 1921-22 the provision is Rs. 3,05,000, whereas in the budget estimate for 1922-23 the amount is put down as Rs. 3,40,000. The difference is about Rs. 35,000. The amount to be reduced has been calculated on the ten per cent basis.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
 “ Sir, attention has been drawn to the fact that whereas in the budget estimate for the year 1921-22 the amount was entered as 2 lakhs and odd, the budget amount for the year 1922-23 is 3 lakhs and odd. The hon. Member therefore comes to the conclusion that we have provided for more during the coming year than what we found necessary to spend in the current year. The hon. Member will recollect what I said during the budget discussion last week.”

“ Reference was made by my friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar to the fact that in the current year the number of sub-collectors entered was seventy-six, whereas for the year following it was only fifty, and that the allotment in the current year was considerably less than that provided for next year, and he asked why when seventy-six sub-collectors were costing less, fifty were going to cost more. It was then stated, Sir, that during the current year there were no more than thirty-five sub-collectors actually working, whereas in the next year we expected the full cadre of fifty to work. We therefore made additional provision for the pay in respect of the

4-45 p.m.

17th March 1922] [Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

additional sub-collectors, namely, fifteen. Therefore, the amount of travelling allowance that would be required for these additional officers has also to be provided for. This provision does not merely represent the travelling allowance of these officers in their revenue capacity; it also again concerns my hon. Colleague, Sir Lionel Davidson, who will be interested, I think, to say a few words about the necessity of this touring in their capacity as divisional magistrates."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I can only repeat, Sir, what I said in regard to the case of Collectors and District Magistrates, namely, that I cannot possibly be a party to any order recommending Subdivisional Magistrates to restrict their touring for motives of economy, if the circumstances or conditions render it necessary or expedient for them to proceed to any part of their respective divisions in the interests of law and order. They must have full discretion to proceed to places where disturbances arise or are apprehended."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" I only request the Government to act according to the principle contained in the resolution which has already been passed by this House. I now beg leave to withdraw my motion "

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 181 to 192.

The following motions were not made :--

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

181. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,25,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 25,000.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

182. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,40,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 34,000.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

183. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,40,000 for travelling allowances by 34,000.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

184. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,40,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 34,000.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

185. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,40,000 for travelling allowances and tentage by Rs. 34,000.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

186. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,40,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 34,000.*

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—

187. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,84,400 for subdivisional establishments by Rs. 3,13,200.*

[17th March 1922]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

188. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,84,400 for subdivisional establishments by 10,000.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

189. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,84,400 for subdivisional establishments by Rs. 100.*

Rao Badadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

190. *To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 60,48,100 for district administration by Rs. 2,00,000.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

191. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 60,48,100 for district administration by Rs. 2,00,000.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

192. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,54,500 for Village Police by Rs. 100.*

Motion 193.

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—“ I beg to move—

193. *To reduce Demand I, Rs. 227.59 lakhs, by Rs. 5,00,000.*

“ Sir, I beg to state that this includes the travelling allowances, etc., to be reduced on the principles that have been laid down by this House. It also includes duty allowances and personal allowances and the increments of salaries of officers of the departments which come under this Demand I.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
“ Sir, I would merely invite the attention of the House once more to the activity which they have already displayed in regard to certain reductions which they have made in the Survey and Settlement departments particularly. In regard to the Land Revenue Department which is also included in the grand total of 227.59 lakhs, hon. Members will please turn to page 34 of the budget estimate from which they will be good enough to notice that every possible retrenchment has already been carried out by me, so much so that the cut has been made almost to the bone. The pruning knife has been applied very freely leaving only the blood arteries merely to continue throbbing. The expenditure in the year 1920-21 was 185.22 lakhs while the budget estimate for the current year was 199.34 lakhs. During the course of the year or before the year had expired we have already reduced the latter figure to 173.19 lakhs, whereas for the next year we have provided for not more than 163.56 lakhs, thereby showing that we have ourselves spontaneously, without any outside pressure, brought about a reduction of 10 lakhs in the Land Revenue Department alone. I would ask the House, therefore, whether with this progressive reduction which has been made by the Government in the course of two years, and in view also of the fact that the proposed expenditure during the next year is nearly 23 lakhs less than the actual expenditure in 1920-21, it will still consider that the allotment entered for the next year is capable of further reduction, unless of course we mean to bring about something like an absolute paralysis of the important limbs of

17th March 1922] [Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai.]

the body politic so as not to make it work effectively. I therefore appeal to the House, seeing that we have already carried out certain economies and having given us now an indication of the lines on which they want further retrenchments to be carried if possible, not to go further and make an indefinite cut in the total allotment without anything like a definite expression of opinion as to the direction in which that has to take effect or as to the manner in which that total reduction should be spread, which, I am afraid, would be rather difficult for the executive to accept. I therefore ask the House not to press this motion."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I beg to support this motion, and I am surprised to see that the hon. the Revenue Member should oppose this very modest reduction. Of course, this is a general reduction and we see how such reductions are carried in other legislatures. So far as we see, the Legislative Assembly has cut down, so far, more than 5 per cent of the expenditure, and in the Punjab more than $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent has been cut down. There is no reason why this very modest request of this Council should not now be granted. The hon. the Revenue Member charged us by saying that this is a very vague and general proposal. We say that we have given indications already to the hon. Member as to where the retrenchments could be effected. In these 200 motions there is ample evidence to show where these 5 lakhs and even more can be cut. Under these circumstances, the hon. the Revenue Member can surely accept this, what I call, very modest reduction."

Mr. M. RATNASWAMI :—"Sir, the hon. the Revenue Member, answering my charge that the cost of collection of revenue was out of all proportion to the revenue, excluded the expenditure on Land Records and Settlement departments, saying that the Land Records and the Settlement departments have nothing to do with the collection of revenue. I do not know what other things than the collection of land revenue the Land Records department has to do. I think the Land Records department is meant to facilitate the collection of revenue to record the rights of Government and to define the dues to Government. Certainly it does not exist in order to serve as an historical manuscripts commission or to add to the beauty of the landscape or for the sake of the rotundity of the revenue system. Then again with regard to the Settlement department, he wanted to exclude that also from consideration in the matter of the collection of revenue. The Settlement department has much more to do with the collection of revenue than the Land Records department. But I think the Settlement department is a very costly department. I go even further and say that this department is also unnecessary. This is not merely an academic opinion but it is the opinion of a Revenue expert whom even the hon. the Revenue Member would have to respect. It is the opinion of Mr. Baden Powell, who in his great work on land revenue systems pointed out so long ago as 1892 that the abolition of the separate settlement staff was everywhere contemplated and went on to say that the 'records kept correct from year to year would never need entire renewal and any future assessment will merely be a revision of the rates on the soil-classification and other data already recorded and so can be done by the ordinary district staff.' Now, at a time like this, when we are all looking forward to reducing the expenditure, I think the Revenue department of the Government of Madras should seriously consider the question of reducing the cost of the Settlement department. The history

[Mr. M. Ratnaswami]

[17th March 1922]

and record of the Settlement department suggest a riddle and its answer, i.e., 'when is a settlement not a settlement?' the answer being. 'When it is made by the Revenue department of the Government of Madras.'

"With regard to the cost of collection of land revenue, by excluding the Land Records department and the Settlement department, and by a number of other exclusions, the hon. the Revenue Member came to the conclusion that it was only 14 per cent of the total revenue. The hon. the Minister for Development the other day deplored that he was not a magician, but he reckoned without the presence of the Revenue Member in the Cabinet. For the Revenue Member, it seems to me, has, by a juggling of the figures, reduced the expenditure from 30 per cent to 14 per cent. From a consideration of the charges of the collection of revenue in the different provinces, we find that Madras tops the list—it has the proud privilege of topping the list in regard to the cost of collecting the land revenue. The Madras percentage comes to 22 per cent., Bombay 21, Burma 14, Assam 17, United Provinces 15 and the Punjab 17. I did not take the cost of collection in Bengal as it has a permanent settlement. I put it to the hon. the Revenue Member, why he and his department should not try seriously to consider the question of reducing the cost of collecting land revenue in the Madras Presidency. If we want to go for a parallel for this abnormal cost of collection, we must go to the *Ancien* régime in France, when the charges of collection of revenue swallowed a good deal of the revenue collected. I can only hope that the fate of the *Ancien* régime in France should teach a lesson to the Government of Madras.

"Well, Sir, in other progressive countries with the progress of civilization and with general material advancement the cost of
5 p.m. collecting revenue has always been reduced proportionately.

In India generally and in Madras in particular the cost of collecting revenue has gone on increasing with the progress of civilization. I think that that is a matter which deserves to be inquired into carefully. The hon. the Finance Member in his opening speech stated and he was gratified in saying that he was the conscience of the Council. Well, Sir, there are two kinds of consciences. There is the good conscience of the good statesman which forces him to review his faults and defects and to correct those faults and defects. There is also another conscience, the bad conscience of the indifferent statesmen which allows him to let things be as they are, and to refuse to disturb vested interests. Now in a time like this, I think the good conscience of the hon. the Finance Member should assert itself against—I do not call it the bad conscience of the hon. the Revenue Member—the indifferent conscience of the hon. the Revenue Member and try to assert economy against the principles of extravagance asserted by the hon. the Revenue Member."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I have been referred to as the conscience of the Council and in this matter of the collection of the revenue I hope I shall be excused if I take the privilege of a conscience and speak plainly. In this matter what the Revenue department reflects is the genius of the people of Madras. Madras is notorious for the way in which it does things to ten places of decimals, and the Revenue department is no exception to the rule. I quite agree, Sir, that it may be possible by making radical changes of policy to make great reductions in the establishment. But I should be sorry to anticipate what the effect of those changes would be upon the economics of the village. The hon. Member who has just spoken

17th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

talked of vested interests as if it were the vested interests of the officers of the department that were concerned. I venture to say, Sir, that the vested interests concerned are the vested interests of the ryot. The net result of our very detailed system of administration is that we protect the interests of the small man. It may be that, if we were to make a permanent settlement or even to settle with the village as in other provinces, we might be able to collect our land revenue more cheaply. It may be that as a result the land would be concentrated in the hands of more enterprising people. But at the same time the small man would go under, and I think that, if we are going to examine the big question of policy, we must examine it from the point of view, among others, of whether we are going to allow the small man to be swallowed up by the larger cultivator."

Mr. M. RATNASWAMI:—"Is not the 'small man' protected in Burma and other places, Sir?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I venture to answer that question in the negative. There is no system anywhere in India which goes into the same meticulous details as ours does. Whether we go too far or not I do not venture to say, though it may certainly be truly said that our system gives facilities for the fractionisation of holdings which has been held to be economically a very bad system. But I do venture to say that we ought not suddenly, by taking a lump sum out of our budget, attempt to alter the whole of the village economic system of the Presidency. While I am quite ready to have the question of policy examined, I put it to the Council that it should be examined as a question of policy in the first instance. I have already told the Council more than once, and the members of the Finance Committee have told the Council, that as a result of their scrutiny of the budget they have made all the economies that can be made without radical changes of policy. What remains now is to examine the radical changes of policy which may facilitate further economies. That is the next step. There are many questions of policy which may be examined, but I venture to think that whatever view we take of them we cannot possibly alter our budget in anticipation of these radical changes being made.

"Then, Sir, the practice of the Assembly has been referred to. What I should like to say with regard to that is that the Assembly have only just appointed their retrenchment committee and have made a beginning in the way of percentage reduction in anticipation of the changes the retrenchment committee is going to make. We, on other hand, have already made our reductions before presenting the budget. The Finance Committee has been at work on the budget for weeks and the work which the Assembly are now going to commence is the work that has already been done here by our Finance Committee. In the case of land revenue, the hon. the Revenue Member has already shown that there has been a cut already of much more than 5 per cent. I should like to say this further with regard to the policy of percentage reduction. The effect of the Assembly making reductions of this sort, in so far as they affect establishments employed in the Provinces upon Central subjects, is to impose upon us the odium of making the detailed cuts which will make up the 5 per cent. The hon. the Mover has attempted to follow the example of the Assembly in this matter. I would invite attention to the fact that this motion is not a single motion but the last of a series of motions which he has brought on this budget. So far as I have been

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[17th March 1922]

able, within the short time available, I have totalled up the amounts of his various motions and find that the total comes up to Rs. 1,89,250. What does this mean? I take it that he has examined the budget with great care and has been able to pick out items aggregating something well under 2 lakhs which he thinks might be reduced. Where then is the balance of 3 lakhs to come from to make up the 5 lakhs he now asks us to cut out. It amounts to this: he comes to us and says, 'I cannot find items to cover these 3 lakhs and odd; but I call upon the hon. the Revenue Member to do so. I am not prepared to take the odium of cutting the pay of officers. But I will throw the odium of doing so upon the Revenue Member'. And I ask whether it is quite fair to my hon. Colleague to cast such a duty upon him."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"Sir, it is only the hon. the Revenue Member and the hon. the Finance Member that have got the power to do that."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I venture to say, Sir, that this Council has the power in so far as the votable items are concerned, while as regards the non-voted items the hon. the Revenue Member and the Finance Member are subject to higher authorities and have no independent powers. Therefore, I say that it was within the power of the hon. Member, if he could pick up items totalling 5 lakhs, to propose the specific reductions up to that amount which he desires to make, and I suggest that the reason why he has not done it is in order to put the odium of cutting out people's pay, which he will not take, upon the shoulders of my hon. Colleague."

"As I have already stated, the items which he has suggested for reduction give a total of Rs. 1,89,250. The House have already cut out items to the total of Rs. 1,61,700. It is not going to be an easy matter to carry on the administration even with that reduction. Some hon. Members have told us that we will be welcome to bring forward supplementary demands if the amount is not enough. But I ask, if we bring forward supplementary demands, how are they going to be met. If this budget is passed, we have to go to the Government of India for a loan to cover our deficit. We shall have difficulties enough to get the Government of India to sanction the money which we now want. We cannot go up for additional loans from time to time throughout the year whenever we find we are unable to carry on. So, Sir, I ask the Council as a responsible body to assume its responsibility in this matter, and if it wishes to cut the pay of Revenue officials to move resolutions making definite cuts. If the Council does this then we can tell the people who are affected that it is the Council which has cut their pay. I do not think it is fair to impose upon my hon. Colleague the duty of making a lump sum reduction and so indirectly putting him in the position of proposing reductions of scales of pay which have been sanctioned by the Secretary of State and which only the Council have now the power to alter."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Mr. President, the charge has been made that we reduced so far as specific items were concerned only to the extent of Rs. 1,61,700 and that we are now adopting the somewhat exceptional course of suggesting a lump sum reduction of about 5 lakhs and throwing the burden of the distribution of the cuts on the hon. the Revenue

17th March 1922]

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

Member. I would like to point out, Sir, that in view of the large number of reductions proposed and the limited time at our disposal, it would not have been possible for us to go through item by item and that was the reason why so many of the reductions were not pressed to a division. Further we felt that we should give the Government discretion in the matter. They of course are much better posted in administrative matters than the Council. They know their mechanism from top to bottom and they have always expressed the greatest possible anxiety to effect economies and we thought we would supply them with a motive by reducing the grants. After all the reduction proposed is very small compared with the total appropriation of over 227 lakhs and odd. In Bombay after the budget was presented and before it was voted upon, the Government undertook to further reduce it by 60 lakhs, that is over half a crore. I distinctly remember that it was on that understanding that the House passed that budget and also consented to the introduction of certain taxation bills. In England too, so long as the question of economies was left in the hands of the departments themselves, very little was done. It is one of the curiosities of departmental psychology that it always considers itself to be infallible. We have had enough of the indifferent economies effected by the departments so far; and the only way we can force them to do it in right earnest is by making reductions of this kind. In England, as I just now submitted, a similar procedure was adopted before reductions of any tangible nature were made. We have had a similar thing in Bombay and in the Imperial Assembly. It has been stated that before the budget was presented reductions to the extent of more than 5 per cent were made. I am not now here to support any particular mathematical proportion, but it always happens that the final budget as adopted by the Government is far less than the appropriations asked for by the different departmental heads. That is nothing unusual. Certain economies have certainly been effected, but the question is: Are they enough? I am constrained to answer that they are not enough and that the small reduction now proposed will not in any way bring the Land Revenue department to a standstill or cause all those calamities that the hon. the Revenue Member apprehends."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"Sir, I rise to support the motion for reduction. Working out the figures, the reduction asked for would come to only 2 per cent of the demand. It has been asked why we should not point out some of the specific items which we want to reduce. I may draw the attention of the hon. Members to the item which has been included in the budget under leave allowances. In page 35 of the budget, under the head Special Fund Audit establishments a sum of Rs. 26,600 is entered, whereas nothing was provided for in the revised estimates for 1921-22."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I say, Sir, that, as I have explained in my opening speech on the budget, the entry of this item is due to a new system of accounting which we have adopted in order to ensure greater accuracy? Previously we used to show the whole provision for the sanctioned cadre and under that a lump amount for probable savings. It is only because we have attempted to be much more exact that we have shown leave allowances separately."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"Last year in the budget the same items are provided and there is a probable saving of
5-15 p.m. Rs. 20,000. This year the probable savings are taken

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu] [17th March 1922]

away and in their place we have this new item of leave allowances. Therefore, I submit, Sir, if these things are properly scrutinized, there will be a saving. In his memorandum the Finance Secretary says that this new item was introduced to avoid going to the Council for supplementary demands from time to time. I think, Sir, it is against the policy of this Council to admit such things. Therefore, I press this motion to a division."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I only wish to point out that the hon. the Finance Member has taken up a position which will satisfy few of us. He wishes us to give him definite proposals and if there is any odium incurred with respect to retrenchment the responsibility should lie with the Council. So far as this Council is concerned, we are prepared to take any odium and give the Government an opportunity of saving 5 lakhs of rupees. He blames us for giving him that liberty. It is not the function of the legislature to give cut and dried proposals. It is for the executive Government to frame proposals in accordance with the wishes of the legislature. I do not think that my hon. Friend was right when he said—

'If, therefore, the Council desire any change in the rates, it is, I submit, for the members interested to put forward a definite scheme and to carry it by a majority. Now the only things approaching a definite scheme which have hitherto been put forward are these.'

"I submit with due deference to him that when this Council expresses a general opinion that there should be a reduction, it is the duty of the executive Government to examine it with the object of giving effect to it. It is not the duty of this Council to give him material for criticism."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" My friend has not quoted me completely. What I said was that the reserved portion of the Government having received orders of the Secretary of State for the revision of salaries of certain officers, we are bound by these orders. It is within the powers of the Council to alter it."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I only wish to add that we cannot put forward any definite scheme which, from whatever quarter it comes, I am perfectly certain, would be subjected to such criticism that it cannot stand. It is my hon. Friend who is competent to make a case just to all the parties concerned. It is asking too much of us to place definite proposals before him. The House gives him the liberty of framing definite proposals."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" There are only one or two points which I would advance from the point of view of the Finance Department. We were most anxious to get proposals from all possible quarters as to any possible retrenchments. We made references to the other departments and dealt drastically with their proposals and as a result the official relations of the Financial Department with the other departments, while they may be described as correct, can hardly be said to be cordial. If, however, the Members of the Council would repudiate any responsibility to make detailed suggestions as to how further reductions should be carried out, it seems to be rather extraordinary that they have tabled something like 800 motions a large percentage of which do convey direct suggestions as to how economy should be carried out. There is only one other point I need refer to. It is the question of leave allowances which has given rise to some misapprehension owing to its being a new entry in the budget. I do not suppose that any

17th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

Member supposes that hitherto those officers who go on leave have not been given leave allowances. It is, of course, not a new item that has been smuggled into the budget because, as I may point out, it is shown under the several heads frankly. It is an improvement in budgeting procedure and surely makes things clearer for the Council. It further obviates having to go to the Council every time some additional officer goes on leave and no reappropriation is possible. As to the method by which we calculated the amount, I need simply say that in the case of departments which have leave reserves like the Survey Department to which reference was made, we have made no provision. In the case of other departments we have, on the advice of the Accountant-General, provided an all-round sum of 5 per cent of the salaries and of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the case of vacation departments. I may say this provision may prove more or less inadequate, because, after all, every officer is entitled to take much more leave than one day out of every twenty days. I trust the Council will accept this explanation and believe that there has been no attempt to get round it in some mysterious way. If that had been our subject, surely we would have said nothing about it and concealed—not displayed—the provision.

"I do not think that there is anything more that I wish to say, Sir. If the hon Member wishes to press his resolution, I take it that every one of the reductions which has been made will be included in that 5 lakhs which is in itself a very big cut."

Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu moved that the question be put. The motion for closure was carried.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON.—"I should like to know, Sir, whether this 5 lakhs is inclusive or exclusive of the previous cuts."

The hon. the PRESIDENT.—"The motion before the House is to reduce the total allotment of Rs 227.59 lakhs by 5 lakhs."

The motion was put to the House and declared carried.

The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter demanded a pole and the same was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 23. Mr. N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai. |
| 2. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad. | 24. Mr. P. Subbarayan. |
| 3. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 25. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayakar. |
| 4. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunachala Mudaliyar. | 26. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 5. Rao Sahib S. Elappa Chettiyar. | 27. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. | 28. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 7. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 29. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. |
| 8. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. | 30. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 9. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 31. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 10. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 32. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 11. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 33. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari. |
| 12. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 34. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimha Chari. |
| 13. Mr. O. Tanikaacha Chettiyar. | 35. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 14. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 36. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| 15. Mr. J. Kuppuswami. | 37. Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. Rama Rao. |
| 16. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 38. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 17. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 39. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 18. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 40. Sriman Sasi Bhushan Bath Mahasayo. |
| 19. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 41. Mr. M. R. Seturatham Ayyar. |
| 20. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | 42. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 21. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandiya Nadar. | |
| 22. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | |

[17th March 1922]

Ayes—cont.

54. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib.
43. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai.
44. Rai Sahib E. M. Mascarenhas.
45. Mr. M. Ratnaswami.
46. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar.
47. Mr. A. T. Palmer.
48. The Zamindar of Mandasa.
49. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan.

50. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur.
51. Saiyid Muhammad Pad-ha Sahib Bahadur.
52. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahiman Sahib.
53. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib.

Noes.

1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson.
2. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter.
3. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lak Sahib.
4. The hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
5. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu.
6. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.

7. Mr. T. E. Moir.
8. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton.
9. Mr. R. Littlehales.
10. Mr. E. Periyannagam.
11. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.
12. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
13. Rao Bahadur T. Namburumal Chettiyar.

The motion was carried, 54 voting *for* and 13 *against* it.

The hon. the President then put the demand for Rs. 227.59 lakhs originally moved subject to a deduction of Rs. 5,00,000.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, there have been three other motions that have been carried."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"If the hon. Member looks at the original demand, he will find that the original demand is for 227.59 lakhs of rupees. The motion last carried is to reduce the total allotment of 227.59 lakhs by the sum of 5 lakhs. If the total of deductions on individual items had exceeded 5 lakhs, that would have been a different matter. But as the total of the individual deductions is less than 5 lakhs, the Government gets Rs. 227.59 minus 5 lakhs or 222.59 lakhs."

The motion was carried and the grant was made.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"May I say, Sir, that we have received only the motions for reduction of grant regarding Demand II—Excise? That will occupy us only for to-morrow morning. We do not know where we are as regards the rest."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The copies are coming in a few minutes and they will be despatched to the Members to-night."

The House then adjourned at 5-30 p.m. to meet again at 11 a.m. on Saturday the 18th March 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.